

K95  
42

# THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

*BOARD OF EDITORS*

CARL BECKER

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY

CHARLES H. HASKINS

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

JAMES H. ROBINSON

CLAUDE H. VAN TYNE

*MANAGING EDITOR*

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

VOLUME XXIV

OCTOBER 1918 TO JULY 1919

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

1919

Reprinted with the permission of the original publisher by  
KRAUS REPRINT CORPORATION  
New York, New York  
1964

Printed in The United States of America

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG  
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXIV

NUMBER 1. OCTOBER, 1918

## ARTICLES

ARTHUR E. R. BOAK	The Extraordinary Commands from 80 to 48 B.C. . . . .	1
SAMUEL F. BEMIS	The United States and the Abortive Armed Neutrality of 1794 . . . .	26
SIDNEY B. FAY	The Kaiser's Secret Negotiations with the Tsar, 1904-1905 . . . .	48

## NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

CHARLES M. ANDREWS	Current Lawful Money of New Eng- land . . . . .	73
--------------------	--	----

REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . . .	78
----------------------------	----

HISTORICAL NEWS . . . . .	141
---------------------------	-----

NUMBER 2. JANUARY, 1919

## ARTICLES

WILLIAM R. THAYER	Vagaries of Historians . . . . .	183
JOSEPH V. FULLER	The War-Scare of 1875 . . . . .	196
LAURENCE M. LARSON	Prussianism in North Sleswick . . . .	227
DOCUMENTS—Captain Nathaniel Pryor, contributed by Walter B. Douglas . . . .		233
REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . . .		266
COMMUNICATION . . . . .		306
HISTORICAL NEWS . . . . .		308

NUMBER 3. APRIL, 1919

## ARTICLES

	The American Historical Association, tion, 1919 . . . . .	349
GUY S. FORD	The Prussian Peasantry before 1807 . . . .	358
VERNER W. CRANE	The Southern Frontier in Queen Anne's War . . . . .	379
WILLIAM TRIMBLE	Diverging Tendencies in New York Democracy in the Period of the Locofocos . . . . .	396
CARL BECKER	The Education of Henry Adams . . . . .	422
NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS		
CARL R. FISH	Back to Peace in 1865 . . . . .	435
DOCUMENTS—Diary and Memoranda of William L. Marcy, 1849-1851, contributed by Thomas M. Mar- shall . . . . .		444
REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . . .		463
CORRECTION . . . . .		524
HISTORICAL NEWS . . . . .		525

(iii)

NUMBER 4. JULY, 1919

## ARTICLES

ALFRED H. SWEET

The English Benedictines and their  
Bishops in the Thirteenth Cen-  
tury . . . . . 565

WILBUR C. ABBOTT

The Origin of English Political  
Parties . . . . . 578

ÉDOUARD DRIAULT

The Coalition of Europe against  
Napoleon . . . . . 603

## NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

WILLIAM A. DUNNING

Disloyalty in Two Wars . . . . . 625

RALPH V. D. MAGOFFIN

Historical Work by Army General  
Staffs . . . . . 630

JOHN R. M. TAYLOR

The History of the War of 1917 . 637

DOCUMENTS—Diary and Memoranda of William L. Marcy, 1857, con-  
tributed by Thomas M. Marshall

REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . . . 654

HISTORICAL NEWS . . . . . 746

INDEX . . . . . 785



The  
American Historical Review

THE EXTRAORDINARY COMMANDS FROM 80 TO 48 B. C.:  
A STUDY IN THE ORIGINS OF THE PRINCIPATE

THE ultimate basis of the Principate, as established by Augustus, was the *imperium*, unrestricted in its scope, which gave its holder the supreme command over the whole army of the empire, so that all troops took the military oath of allegiance to him and obeyed his orders.<sup>1</sup> The *maius imperium* which the Princeps held was essentially an extraordinary *imperium*, because of the fact that it conferred the sole independent command over all the Roman troops, was not limited to any definite area, and, after a short time, was freed likewise from any temporal restriction. Mommsen<sup>2</sup> long ago pointed out that this was but the culmination of a series of extraordinary *imperia* of a military nature which had been created from time to time during the last century of the republic, and which must be regarded as preparatory steps in the establishment of the Principate. In this respect the career of Pompey the Great especially foreshadowed that of Augustus.

It is the purpose of this study to trace the history of these extraordinary commands from the reforms of Sulla to the victory of Caesar at Pharsalia: not only such as fall within Mommsen's classification as the commands of extraordinary military officials,<sup>3</sup> but all commands which were extraordinary in that they exceeded in some way the *imperia* of the regularly constituted officials and required to be created or defined by a special enactment of the Senate or Comitia. It is hoped that the study of these commands in their chronological order, apart from other political problems of the time,

<sup>1</sup> Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, vol. II., pt. 2 (third ed.), p. 840 ff. All subsequent references to this work are to the third edition.

<sup>2</sup> *Staatsrecht*, vol. II., pt. 1, p. 662.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

will help to bring into clearer light the essentially military character of the foundations of the Principate.

For the purpose in view it will be found convenient to consider separately the following periods: (I.) 80-70 B. C.; (II.) 70-60 B. C.; (III.) 60-48 B. C.

# I. THE EXTRAORDINARY COMMANDS UNDER SENATORIAL CONTROL, 80-70 B. C.

Before the reorganization of the Roman governmental system effected by Sulla in the years 81 and 80 B. C., it had been the regular custom for the consuls, in virtue of their *imperium militiae*, to undertake any military operations required by circumstances arising within or without the empire during their term of office. The exercise of this power had been restricted in some degree by the creation of the provincial governorships, whose holders had authority to deal with such wars as were confined within the limits of their respective spheres, but even within these provinces the consul could exercise his *maius imperium* when occasion demanded. Thus the conduct of wars with other peoples was a recognized part of the consul's duties, and, if he who first undertook the command failed to end the affair, the consul of the following year succeeded to the command of the army in the field, unless the former was retained beyond his regular term, as a proconsul. The determination of the consular *provinciae* had come to be entirely in the hands of the Senate,<sup>4</sup> and up to 123 B. C. they had been decided upon after the election of the consuls. The Lex Sempronia (*de provinciis consularibus*) of that year weakened the senatorial control by requiring that these *provinciae* be fixed prior to the elections, although the Senate's authority was recognized by a provision forbidding the use of the veto on the senatorial assignments.<sup>5</sup>

But the vicissitudes of war had forced the Romans to depart at times from their regular system. For example, in 211 B. C. Publius Cornelius Scipio, who had not yet held any magistracy, in place of one of the consuls, as they were needed for the conduct of the war in Italy, was entrusted with the command in Spain with the *imperium* of a proconsul, by a special law of the Comitia Centuriata.<sup>6</sup> In 147 B. C. Scipio Aemilianus, then consul elect, received the command in the war against Carthage by a special vote of the people,<sup>7</sup> and in

<sup>4</sup> Livy, XXI. 17 (218 B. C.).

<sup>5</sup> Sallust, *Jugurtha*, 27; Cicero, *Pro Domo*, 9, 24; *De Provinciis Consularibus*, 8, 17.

<sup>6</sup> Livy, XXVI. 18; XXVIII. 43, 11.

<sup>7</sup> Appian, *Libyca*, 112.

the same way Marius, consul for 107, had been appointed to conduct the war against Jugurtha.<sup>8</sup> In the first case we have to do with the creation of an extraordinary office, and in the last two with the usurpation by the Comitia of the Senate's right to fix the consular provinces.

Military necessities had likewise brought about the four successive consulships of Marius, and the danger of such a prolonged military command, over an army of professional soldiers, in the hands of the first magistrate, had been revealed by the union of the popular demagogues with the soldiers' idol, which caused the temporary success of Saturninus and Glaucia, and the sixth consulship of Marius. That the value of such an important military command in conjunction with the consulship was fully recognized by Roman political parties is shown by the struggle between Marius and Sulla for the command in the Mithradatic War in 88 B. C., when the former actually succeeded in having a law passed which conferred the command upon him, although he was then a *privatus*.<sup>9</sup> In 83 Sulla demonstrated more clearly than ever that the successful general was master of the political situation. Thus the problem of the command in every war of any considerable magnitude was almost certain to contain a latent danger to the security of the Senate's control of the state.

This fact cannot have escaped the notice of Sulla, when he endeavored to place the Senate once more firmly in the saddle, and the study of the extraordinary commands during the decade following his abdication of the dictatorship will show what measures, if any, he took to protect the Senate against the rise of an ambitious general of the opposing faction, while it may also throw light upon what limitations were placed upon the exercise of the *imperium militiae* by the consuls in office.

(a) *The Command of Pompey in Sicily and in Africa, 82-79 B. C.*

The decade 80-70 B. C. opens with an extraordinary command that had originated during the struggle between Sulla and the party of Marius, namely that of Cnaeus Pompey in Africa, which won him the honor of a triumph on March 12, 79 B. C.<sup>10</sup> The origin and precise nature of this command are not very clearly indicated in our sources. Apparently, up to 82 B. C., Pompey was merely in the position of commander of the forces which he had raised by his own efforts, without any official warrant for his authority, but gladly

<sup>8</sup> Sallust, *Jug.*, 73, 7; 84, 1.

<sup>9</sup> Appian, *De Bellis Civilibus*, I. 56.

<sup>10</sup> Granius Licinianus, 36; Livy, *Periochae*, 89; *CIL*. (second ed.), I. 178.

welcomed by Sulla and acting under his orders. However, in that year, while Sulla remained in Italy, Pompey received a commission to carry on the war in Sicily and, later, in Africa. He now exercised an *imperium* bestowed by a decree of the Senate.<sup>11</sup> This *imperium* was that of a *propraetor*,<sup>12</sup> but he himself was as yet a mere equestrian, having held no magistracy.<sup>13</sup> Still, the conferment of *imperium* upon a *privatus* was, as we have seen, not without precedent, and in the turmoil of the civil war would have passed with little comment had not Pompey insisted on a triumph.<sup>14</sup> The novel feature of his appointment was that it was made by the Senate without any participation by the *Comitia*. However, few could have thought of it as the first of a long series of extraordinary commands which had such fatal consequences for the senatorial régime.

(b) *Pompey's Command against Lepidus, 77 B. C.*

After a brief interval, in 77 B. C., Pompey received his second extraordinary command, on the occasion of the revolt of Lepidus against the Senate. Plutarch<sup>15</sup> tells us that Pompey, throwing in his lot with the Senate, was appointed *στρατεύματος ἡγεμών* against Lepidus. Our other sources merely record his part in the struggle without reference to his appointment or position. We have to determine, therefore, whether Pompey actually held an *imperium*, and, if so, what it was. One might suppose that Pompey was merely a *legatus* of Catulus, who was proconsul and the senatorial commander. The Senate, as is well known, had control of the appointments of *legati* until 59 B. C.,<sup>16</sup> and his was a senatorial commission. But if such were the case it seems likely that Plutarch would have styled him *ὑποστρατηγός* or *πρεσβεύς*.<sup>17</sup> Further, in view of the fact that Pompey had just recently enjoyed a *propraetorian imperium*, it is hardly likely that he would have been content with a post of lesser rank.

We may conclude then that the senate, having need of an experienced general such as Pompey already was, and fearing that he

<sup>11</sup> "Cum imperio, a senatu missus", Livy, *Per.*, 89; *δόγμα συγκλήτου*, Plutarch, *Pompey*, 11.

<sup>12</sup> Gran. Licin., 36: "eques Romanus, quod nemo ante propraetore ex Africa triumphavit IV Idus Martias".

<sup>13</sup> Livy, *Per.*, 89: "adhuc eques Romanus, quod nulli contigerat, ex Africa triumphavit".

<sup>14</sup> From the references quoted it will be seen that this is what created the greatest impression at the time; cf. Plut., *Pomp.*, 14.

<sup>15</sup> *Pomp.*, 16.

<sup>16</sup> Cicero, *In Vatinius*, 15, 35.

<sup>17</sup> As in *Pomp.*, 25.

might join the popular party, sought to bind him more firmly to their interests by giving him a command when he attached himself to their cause. His *imperium* would naturally be defined. That it was not proconsular is certain, for he was under the orders of Catulus, at least nominally.<sup>18</sup> Most probably, therefore, it was a command *pro praetore*. The most important features of this appointment are that it was again as a *privatus* that Pompey received his command, and that he was given it by the Senate.

(c) *Pompey's Command against Sertorius in Spain, 77-71 B. C.*

In the same year Pompey received his third extraordinary command, regarding which we have fuller information than in the preceding cases. The war against Sertorius in Spain was going badly for the Romans. Metellus, who had been sent out while consul to Hispania Ulterior in 80 B. C. and who had remained there as proconsul, failed to make any headway.<sup>19</sup> In 79 B. C. Domitius Ahenobarbus, the praetor governing Hispania Citerior with proconsular rank, had fallen in battle.<sup>20</sup> Lucius Manlius, the proconsul from Narbo, coming to the help of Metellus, met the same fate.<sup>21</sup> The despatch of a new commander was an imperative necessity. It was considered the duty of the consuls to go,<sup>22</sup> but they refused.<sup>23</sup> Then Pompey, eager for new laurels, sought the command. He had refused to disband his army at the orders of Catulus, and at the head of his troops awaited the answer to his demand.<sup>24</sup> In spite of considerable opposition within their ranks, the senators, on the motion of Lucius Philippus, passed a decree conferring the command upon him.<sup>25</sup>

Thus Pompey, while still a mere *eques*,<sup>26</sup> was entrusted with proconsular *imperium* for the conduct of a serious war. Although exercising this *imperium pro consule*,<sup>27</sup> equal with that of Metellus,<sup>28</sup> he had not the title proconsul. Indeed, as was remarked sarcastically

<sup>18</sup> *Pomp.*, 17.

<sup>19</sup> Appian, *B. C.*, I. 97; Valerius Maximus, 9, 3, 9.

<sup>20</sup> Sallust, *Hist.*, I. 111; Plut., *Sertorius*, 12; Eutropius, VI. 1; Liv., *Per.*, 90.

<sup>21</sup> Plut., *Sert.*, 12; Liv., *Per.*, 90.

<sup>22</sup> Cic., *Pro Lege Manilia*, 21, 62.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*; *Philippica*, XI. 8, 18: "consules recusabant".

<sup>24</sup> Plut., *Pomp.*, 17.

<sup>25</sup> Cic., *Pro Leg. Man.*, 21, 62; *Phil.*, XI. 8, 18.

<sup>26</sup> *Locc. cit.*; Liv., *Per.*, 91; Plut., *Pomp.*, 17.

<sup>27</sup> [Aurel. Vict.], *De Viris Illustribus*, in calling Pompey praetor with proconsular *imperium*, has in mind the constitutional position of the regular governors in Spain. Liv., *Per.*, 91, erroneously has *imperium consulare*.

<sup>28</sup> Valerius Maximus, VIII. 15, 8: "pari imperio cum Pio Metello principe civitatis".

in the Senate, he went *pro consulibus, non pro consule*.<sup>29</sup> His *provincia* is not specifically recorded. Cicero merely says that Pompey was entrusted with the *bellum Sertorianum*,<sup>30</sup> while Plutarch describes him as *Μεγάλη βοήθης*.<sup>31</sup> However, it seems beyond question that Pompey's *provincia* was Hither Spain, for no successor was sent to the slain Domitius, and Metellus, governor of the other province, remained in Spain until a few months before the return of Pompey himself in 71.<sup>32</sup>

It is interesting to compare this command of Pompey, the first of its kind created under the Sullan "constitution" regarding which we have definite information, with the command conferred upon Publius Cornelius Scipio in 211 B. C., for the latter doubtless served as a precedent for Pompey's appointment. Both men had previously distinguished themselves as soldiers, but Pompey had commanded armies, while Scipio was a mere *tribunus militum*. Neither, however, had as yet held any magistracy. In both cases the appointments were occasioned by the defeat of Roman armies in Spain, where they found their sphere of operations. Their *imperia* were the same—proconsular. But there were some striking differences in the way in which the commands were obtained. Scipio volunteered his services as a simple burgess; Pompey demanded his appointment, with an army at his back. A still greater contrast appears in the authorities conferring these commands. Scipio received his by a *lex* of the Comitia Centuriata; Pompey's was created by a *senatus consultum* without any sanction by the *populus*. Yet the legality of the latter was never questioned.

(d) *The Commands of Lucullus and Cotta in 74 B. C.*

Nicomedes III., king of Bithynia, died in the fall of 75 B. C.<sup>33</sup> and left his kingdom to the Romans.<sup>34</sup> Meanwhile Mithradates, king of Pontus, having reorganized his forces after his defeat at Sulla's hands, was in correspondence with Sertorius and preparing to renew his attack of 88 B. C. upon the Roman power in Asia.<sup>35</sup> The war began in the spring of 74, while Lucullus and Cotta were the consuls at Rome.<sup>36</sup> The consular provinces for the following

<sup>29</sup> Cic., *Phil.*, XI. 8, 18.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> *Pomp.*, 17; Appian, *Iberica*, 76, wrongly calls him the successor of Metellus.

<sup>32</sup> Drumann-Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*, IV. 392.

<sup>33</sup> On the question of the year, cf. Maurenbrecher, *Sallusti Historiae*, II. 228.

<sup>34</sup> Appian, *B. C.*, I. 111; Liv., *Per.*, 93.

<sup>35</sup> Appian, *De Bello Mithridatico*, 70; Plut., *Sert.*, 23; Eutrop., VI. 6.

<sup>36</sup> Maurenbrecher, *Sall. Hist.*, loc. cit.

year had been allotted already and Lucullus had obtained Cisalpine Gaul.<sup>37</sup> But as there was prospect of a war of considerable magnitude arising in Asia Minor he was anxious to be transferred there and to be entrusted with the command so as to win a reputation that would offset the renown that Pompey was acquiring in Spain.<sup>38</sup> At this juncture word came that Octavius, the proconsul of Cilicia, was dead.<sup>39</sup> At once Lucullus sought to have his proconsular command transferred to that province, and, having won over to his side Cethegus, the political "boss" of the day, not only attained his immediate object, but also had the conduct of the war against Mithradates placed in his hands.<sup>40</sup> At the same time his colleague Cotta received a minor command.

Lucullus and Cotta received their commands from the Senate.<sup>41</sup> Cotta was sent to Bithynia to protect the Hellespont,<sup>42</sup> while to Lucullus were entrusted the main operations—"ut Mithridatem persequeretur".<sup>43</sup> The provinces of Cilicia and Asia were placed under his authority.<sup>44</sup> He was likewise authorized to take one legion from Italy, and to assume command of the two Fimbrian legions still in Asia. A fleet was also placed at his disposal.<sup>45</sup>

The consuls proceeded to their commands during their term of office: therefore with consular *imperium*.<sup>46</sup> But for the year 73 and subsequently they were proconsuls and had the *imperium proconsulare*.<sup>47</sup>

The power of Lucullus at its height in 70 B. C. is worthy of attention. He had a fleet and an army, and governed practically the whole of Asia Minor, including Asia, Cilicia, and the newly acquired Bithynia. Cotta had only operated on the coast and went home after taking Heraclea in 70 B. C.<sup>48</sup>

The noteworthy features of these two commands are that they

<sup>37</sup> Plut., *Luc.*, 5.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.* Pompey was also threatening to return with his legions, *Pomp.*, 20.

<sup>39</sup> Plut., *Luc.*, 6.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*; Cic., *Paradoxa*, V. 3, 40.

<sup>41</sup> Cic., *Academica Priora*, II. 1, 1: "ad Mithridaticum bellum missus a senatu"; Memnon, *Fg.*, c. 37.

<sup>42</sup> Memnon, *loc. cit.*; Plut., *Luc.*, 6; Cic., *Pro Murena*, 15, 33.

<sup>43</sup> Cic., *Pro Murena*, 15, 33.

<sup>44</sup> For Cilicia see above. In Asia no successor was appointed to Marcus Junius, propraetor in 75, and Lucullus reorganized the taxation there in 70 B. C. Plut., *Luc.*, 20, 23; App., *B. M.*, 83; Velleius Paterculus, II. 33; Cic., *Acad. Pr.*, II. 1, 3; Pro Flacco, 85.

<sup>45</sup> App., *B. M.*, 76; Plut., *Luc.*, 6, 12.

<sup>46</sup> Liv., *Per.*, 93, 94; Cic., *Pro Mur.*, 15, 33; App., *B. M.*, 72; Maurenbrecher, *Sall. Hist.*, II. 228; "consulari imperio", Cic., *Pro Flacco*, 34, 85.

<sup>47</sup> Liv., *Per.*, 95.

<sup>48</sup> Memnon, *Fg.*, 51.



were entrusted by the Senate to the two consuls, and that the latter undertook them during their term of office. Our sources do not comment upon this as an unusual or unconstitutional proceeding.

(e) *The Command of Antonius against the Pirates, 74 B. C.*

In the year in which the consuls Lucullus and Cotta went to the East to carry on war against Mithradates, the strength of the pirates in the Mediterranean caused a special effort to be made to crush them. For this purpose an extraordinary command was created, which, in the absence of the consuls, was conferred upon a praetor, Marcus Antonius, through the influence of Cotta and the faction of Cethegus.<sup>49</sup>

Antonius received this command by a senatorial decree,<sup>50</sup> by which he was authorized to war against the pirates along the whole coast line of the Mediterranean.<sup>51</sup> His command, almost free from territorial limitations, extending as it did over the whole sea and its shores, was called an *imperium infinitum*,<sup>52</sup> a term which appeared then for the first time in the history of the extraordinary commands. An inscription from Epidaurus, reading Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου τοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν [πάν]των στρατηγοῦ gives the Greek interpretation of his imperium.<sup>53</sup> The conception of the *imperium infinitum* associated with the idea of the command at sea was destined to play a very important rôle in the growth of the extraordinary commands.

As a praetor, Antonius must have exercised a praetorian *imperium*, which would have made him equal in rank with the proprae-tors in the provinces, but subordinate to such governors as had pro-consular *imperium*, including Pompey and Lucullus.

(f) *The Command of Crassus against Spartacus, 72 B. C.*

The insurrection of the gladiators and slaves in southern Italy, which had broken out in 73 B. C.,<sup>54</sup> had assumed alarming propor-

<sup>49</sup> [Asconius] in *Verr. II.*, p. 206; Vell. Pat., II. 31, 3.

<sup>50</sup> *Locc. cit.*

<sup>51</sup> [Ascon.] in *Verr. I.*, 60, p. 176: "tota ora maritima"; Lactantius, I. 11; Schol. ad Juv., VIII. 105: "ora maritima qua Romanorum esset imperium"; cf. [Ascon.] in *Verr. II.*, p. 206.

<sup>52</sup> Cic., *In Verrem, actio secunda*, II. 3, 8: "post M. Antoni infinitum illud imperium"; III. 91, 213: "ita se in isto infinito imperio M. Antonium gessisse"; Lact., I. 11; "curatio infinita", [Ascon.] in *Verr. I.*, 60.

<sup>53</sup> *IG.*, IV. 932, 1, 25. That this inscription refers to the Antonius in question and not to his father of the same name (as Fränkel, in *IG.*) seems clearly proven by Wilhelm, *Beiträge zur Gr. Inschriftenkunde* (Vienna, 1909), p. 114.

<sup>54</sup> Cic., *Ad Atticum*, VI. 2, 8; *De Haruspicum Responsis*, 25; Liv., *Per.*, 95; App., *B. C.*, I. 116, 539; Vell. Pat., II. 30, 5; Plut., *Crass.*, 8; Flor., II. 8, 3; Orosius, V. 21, 1.



tions in the following year. Spartacus, the leader of the gladiators, had defeated both consuls, Lentulus and Gellius, as well as a proconsul and two praetors who exercised subordinate commands.<sup>55</sup> The situation in 72 was accordingly so serious that the Senate recalled the consuls from the field to make room for a new commander.<sup>56</sup> Their choice fell upon the praetor Marcus Licinius Crassus, who, when all others shrank from the task, volunteered his services.<sup>57</sup>

As we have no information to the contrary, we must conclude that the *imperium* of Crassus was praetorian, in accordance with his magisterial rank. His sphere of operations was the conduct of the war against the gladiators,<sup>58</sup> and thus the duration of his command was loosely indicated. The forces at his disposal were six new legions, in addition to the consular legions already in the field.<sup>59</sup>

Crassus received his commission from the Senate.<sup>60</sup> The circumstances under which he was appointed show that it was the ordinary procedure for the consuls to exercise the military *imperium* within the Italian peninsula, but also that it was within the power of the Senate to supersede them in favor of another general of their own choosing. The extraordinary nature of the command of Crassus, therefore, consists in his appointment while a praetor, when there were consuls still in office. Had there been no consuls in Italy at the time, then the command would naturally have devolved upon one of the praetors.

From the preceding survey of the extraordinary commands from 80 to 70 B. C. we obtain the following results. Three times a private citizen, once the two consuls, and twice a praetor were entrusted with extraordinary *imperia*. These commands they received from the Senate alone, without any expression of the will of the Comitia. The Senate defined the commands as well as created and appointed to them. In point of time the commands of this decade were not definitely restricted, but as they were created for specific purposes they naturally terminated when these military objects were attained. The consuls were able to undertake such commands outside of

<sup>55</sup> App., *B. C.*, I. 117; Liv., *Per.*, 96; Plut., *Crass.*, 9. The proconsul was C. Cassius, governor of Cisalpine Gaul.

<sup>56</sup> Oros., V. 24, 5; Plut., *Crass.*, 10. For the date, 72 B. C., cf. Drumann-Groebe, IV. 91.

<sup>57</sup> App., *B. C.*, I. 118.

<sup>58</sup> Liv., *Per.*, 96: "idque bellum M. Crasso praetori mandatum est"; Plut., *Crass.*, 10.

<sup>59</sup> App., *B. C.*, I. 118; Oros., V. 24, 5.

<sup>60</sup> Plut., *Crass.*, 10; Oros., *loc. cit.*

Italy and, indeed, were looked upon as the first persons to be considered when such nominations were made. Within Italy itself the consuls exercised the *imperium militiae* when need arose, as a matter of course, without this being considered as an extraordinary command. Consequently we are obliged to conclude that Sulla had passed no law making the consulship a purely civil office.<sup>61</sup> However, in practice, the consuls were not regularly employed for overseas campaigns, and, as there was little opportunity for the exercise of their military *imperium* within the boundaries of the peninsula, practically, if not theoretically, their duties were almost exclusively of a civil character.<sup>62</sup> The idea of the consular *imperium* as higher than that of all provincial governors still remained; likewise the view that the consuls could exercise this outside of Italy.<sup>63</sup> The consuls had not lost the *imperium militiae*<sup>64</sup> although it tended to become a dormant right. And so when they were called upon to exercise it outside of Italy, they did so by virtue of a special senatorial decree which gave them what was really an extraordinary command. Even in Italy the exercise of the *imperium* by the consuls might be suspended by the Senate in favor of an extraordinary commander.

Accordingly, we see that the Senate was in possession of an apparently unchallenged right to select any person it chose to exercise military *imperium* in any sphere determined by itself. The question, then, arises, "Did the Senate acquire this power by one of Sulla's laws?" At any rate we have no mention of such an enactment. But the creation of extraordinary *imperia* had previously been a prerogative of the Comitia and the action of the Senate was at least contrary to precedent.<sup>65</sup> Possibly it may have been looked upon as a development of the power of the Senate over the allotment of the provinces.

The object of the Senate's action is not far to seek. By exercising a free choice in the appointment of a commander the Senate was able to avoid entrusting an important campaign to an incapable consul and could utilize the services of the best general or generals at its disposal. Furthermore, it hoped in this way to be able to prevent a suspected opponent, especially if a consul, from obtaining a command that might give him the power to undermine the Senate's

<sup>61</sup> As Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, I. 378.

<sup>62</sup> This is the view of Pelham, *Outlines of Roman History*, p. 238, note 3.

<sup>63</sup> Cic., *Phil.*, IV. 9: "in consulis jure et imperio debent esse provinciae"; *Ad Att.*, VIII. 15: "consules, quibus more majorum concessum est, vel omnes adire provincias".

<sup>64</sup> As Mommsen implies, *Staatsr.*, vol. II., pt. 1, p. 654; vol. II., pt. 2, p. 846; cf. I. 57.

<sup>65</sup> Mommsen, *Staatsr.*, vol. II., pt. 1, p. 658.

influence. Doubtless the Senate expected its appointees quietly to resign their commands at its behest. The question was, could it retain this power over the extraordinary commands and would its commanders always prove subservient to its authority.

Finally, we have noted the first appearance of an *imperium infinitum* in the shape of an extraordinary command at sea, a sphere which, with the lapse of the active exercise of the consuls' military *imperium*, stood outside of any permanent command.<sup>66</sup>

## II. THE RIVALRY OF THE SENATE AND THE COMITIA FOR THE CONTROL OF THE EXTRAORDINARY COMMANDS, 70-60 B. C.

Before taking up the extraordinary commands of this period it is necessary to call attention to the restoration of the tribunician power, which Sulla had so narrowly restricted. By the Lex Aurelia of 75 B. C. the law which made the tribunate a bar to other offices was revoked,<sup>67</sup> and, in the consulate of Pompey and Crassus, 70 B. C., this office recovered the remainder of the rights of which it had been deprived, including the power to initiate legislation.<sup>68</sup> This was destined to prove a very important factor in the creation of future extraordinary commands.

### (a) *The Command of Pompey against the Pirates, 67 B. C.*

Marcus Antonius, the praetor, who, as we have seen, had been sent with an extraordinary command against the pirates in 74, had failed to accomplish anything before his death in 72.<sup>69</sup> The ravages of these corsairs subsequently extended so widely and the damage they inflicted upon commerce was so great that Rome was again obliged to take action against them. The result was that Pompey, now the recognized leader of the popular party, was appointed to sweep the pirates from the seas.

This extraordinary command of Pompey was created by a law proposed by the tribune Aulus Gabinius,<sup>70</sup> to appoint a single commander against the pirates,<sup>71</sup> which was passed after considerable opposition from the senatorial faction.<sup>72</sup> Although this law did not name the person upon whom this command was to be conferred,

<sup>66</sup> Mom., *Staatsr.*, vol. II., pt. 1, p. 654.

<sup>67</sup> Ascon. in *Cornel.*, pp. 66, 67.

<sup>68</sup> Liv., *Per.*, 97; Vell. Pat., II. 30; Plut., *Pomp.*, 22.

<sup>69</sup> Liv., *Per.*, 97.

<sup>70</sup> Liv., *Per.*, 99; Plut., *Pomp.*, 25; Dio, XXXVI. 23-24.

<sup>71</sup> Cic., *Pro Leg. Man.*, 17, 52: "lex de uno imperatore contra piratas constituendo"; Dio, XXXVI. 23: στρατηγὸν ἓνα αὐτοκράτορα ἐφ' ἀπαντας αὐτοὺς.

<sup>72</sup> Dio, XXXVI. 24; Plut., *Pomp.*, 25.

only restricting the appointment to persons of consular rank,<sup>73</sup> yet the opinion of the voters was so clearly expressed in a *contio* that the choice of Pompey was a certainty.<sup>74</sup> His actual nomination to the command was made in a *senatus consultum*,<sup>75</sup> in accordance with the terms of the law.

Pompey's *provincia* was defined by the Gabinian law as embracing the whole sea within the Pillars of Hercules and all Roman territory to a distance of fifty miles inland, including the islands.<sup>76</sup> The appointment was for three years and carried with it extensive powers.<sup>77</sup> These included the right to select *legati* of senatorial rank, to raise money in addition to what he received from the quaestors, and to use his discretion in recruiting soldiers and men for his fleet.<sup>78</sup> The number of *legati* was at first fixed at fifteen but was later raised to twenty-four; likewise the naval contingent was increased from 200 to 500 ships; and two quaestors were attached to his command. These additions were made through a law of the Comitia.<sup>79</sup>

The extent of Pompey's *provincia* naturally brought his *imperium* into conflict with that of the provincial governors: hence it required precise definition. Accordingly it was defined as equal with the *imperia* of the provincial governors of proconsular rank, "*imperium aequum in omnibus provinciis cum proconsulibus*".<sup>80</sup> With considerable exaggeration Plutarch calls it a "monarchy" and "an absolute universal authority". Like the command of Antonius in 74, it was also an *imperium infinitum* and may be fully defined as an *imperium infinitum aequum*. Mommsen<sup>81</sup> thought of it as the old unlimited consular *imperium* with the restriction that on the coasts of the empire it was equal to that of the rulers of the provinces in question, but not superior. However, that interpretation does not seem quite satisfactory, for, although the extent of Pompey's *provincia* recalls the old sphere of the consul's activities, nevertheless not only in the provinces but also in Italy<sup>82</sup> and undoubtedly at sea

<sup>73</sup> Dio, *loc. cit.*; Cic., *Pro Leg. Man.*, 17, 52.

<sup>74</sup> Plut., *Pomp.*, 25; Dio, *loc. cit.*

<sup>75</sup> Vell. Pat., II. 31, 3; Dio, XXXVI. 37.

<sup>76</sup> App., *B. M.*, 94; Vell. Pat., II. 31, 3; Plut., *Pomp.*, 25; Dio, XXXVI. 36a and 37, 1.

<sup>77</sup> Dio, XXXVI. 23; App., *B. M.*, 94.

<sup>78</sup> App., *B. M.*, 94, gives 6000 Attic talents as the amount received from the treasury; Plut., *Pomp.*, 25; Dio, XXXVI. 23-24.

<sup>79</sup> Plut., *Pomp.*, 25, who gives the troops at his disposal as 120,000 foot and 5000 horse.

<sup>80</sup> Vell. Pat., II. 31, 3, who points out the analogy between this command and that of Antonius seven years before; Dio, XXXVI. 37, 1.

<sup>81</sup> *Staatsr.*, II. 654.

<sup>82</sup> Dio, XXXVI. 37, 1.

it was only an *imperium pro consule*. The best evidences that it was an *imperium aequum* and not *maius* are the refusals of Metellus, proconsul in Crete,<sup>83</sup> and Piso in Gaul<sup>84</sup> to submit to Pompey's orders.

(b) *The Command of Pompey in the East, 66 B. C.*

Within three months after the passing of the Gabinian law Pompey had completed his task of clearing the Mediterranean of pirates.<sup>85</sup> But the war with Mithradates and Armenia still lingered on. Lucullus, owing to the mutiny of his troops, had been unable to carry out his plans and the enemy had begun to recover lost ground.<sup>86</sup> Besides he had offended the capitalist class by his reorganization of the tribute of Asia. Already he had been superseded in the command of Asia, Bithynia, and Cilicia, and now a movement was on foot to take away the remnants of his power.<sup>87</sup> This was finally accomplished in 66 B. C. by a law of the tribune Manilius,<sup>88</sup> which transferred the command of Lucullus to Pompey, much to the dissatisfaction of the senatorial party.

This Manilian law extended the *provincia* of Pompey by the addition of the command against Mithradates and Tigranes, of the territory still under the authority of Lucullus, of Bithynia where Glabrio was governor, and of Cilicia.<sup>89</sup> Two years of the time allotted for the command against the pirates had still to run, so the powers he had acquired by the Gabinian law had not lapsed. For the new command no specific limit was set.

Pompey's *imperium* remained as before, ἐπὶ τῆς ὁμοίας ἐξουσίας, as Appian expresses it.<sup>90</sup> But he now received the general power to make peace or war wherever he wished,<sup>91</sup> and in Plutarch<sup>92</sup> his position appears as the concentration of the whole power of the state in one hand.

<sup>83</sup> Liv., *Per.*, 99; Plut., *Pomp.*, 29.

<sup>84</sup> Dio, XXXVI. 37, 2.

<sup>85</sup> Plut., *Pomp.*, 28.

<sup>86</sup> Plut., *Luc.*, 34 and 35.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>88</sup> Cic., *Pro Leg. Man.*; Vell. Pat., II. 33; Liv., *Per.*, 100; Plut., *Pomp.*, 30; *Luc.*, 35; Dio, XXXVI. 42-43.

<sup>89</sup> Liv., *Per.*, 100; Vell. Pat., II. 33; App., *B. M.*, 97; Plut., *Pomp.*, 30; *Luc.*, 35; Dio, XXXVI. 42.

<sup>90</sup> *B. M.*, 97.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*: αὐτοκράτορα ὄντα, ὅπη θέλοι, συντίθεσθαι τε καὶ πολεμεῖν, καὶ φίλους ἢ πολεμικοὺς Ῥωμαίους οὕς δοκιμάσειε ποιεῖσθαι.

<sup>92</sup> *Pomp.*, 30.

(b) *The Proposed Land Commission of Servilius Rullus, 64-63 B. C.*

While Pompey was absent in the East several attempts were made by other prominent leaders of the popular party to secure for themselves extraordinary commands to counterbalance his increasing power.

The first of these attempts, regarding which the details are obscure, had something to do with Egypt, and seems to have been the result of a coalition between Caesar and Crassus. In 65 B. C. Crassus made an unsuccessful attempt to enroll Egypt and Cyprus among the Roman provinces, on the basis of the alleged will of Alexander, king of Egypt, who died in 81 B. C.<sup>93</sup>

With this move of Crassus coincides an attempt on the part of Julius Caesar to obtain an extraordinary *imperium* by a plébiscite presented by some of the tribunes to assign Egypt to him as his province.<sup>94</sup> This proposition likewise failed because of the vehement opposition of the opposite faction. But in the following year the same men launched a still more ambitious project.

This was contained in the land law introduced by the tribune P. Servilius Rullus. The agitation for this measure had begun shortly after the consular elections in 64, and its definite provisions were known after the tribunician elections of the same year.<sup>95</sup> It was opposed by Cicero in his *De Lege Agraria* of January 1, 63, and was subsequently withdrawn.<sup>96</sup> Although this proposal failed to become law, the extraordinary command which it aimed to create deserves attention.

This extraordinary command was to be vested in a land commission of ten members,<sup>97</sup> to be elected from candidates of praetorian rank who should announce their own candidature. The election was to take place in a special Comitia of seventeen tribes, whom Rullus should choose by lot.<sup>98</sup> By these means Pompey would be excluded from the list of candidates and the conduct of the elections placed in the hands of the authors of the law. No names were proposed by Rullus, but all were aware that the scheme was concocted in the interests of Crassus and Caesar, and that they would be the dominating members of the commission.<sup>99</sup>

The term of office for the commissioners was to be five years.

<sup>93</sup> Cic., *De Lege Agraria*, II. 17, 44; Plut., *Crass.*, 13.

<sup>94</sup> Suetonius, *Julius*, 11.

<sup>95</sup> December 10. Cic., *De Leg. Agr.*, II. 5, 11 and 13; Plut., *Cic.*, 12.

<sup>96</sup> Cic., *In Pisonem*, 2, 4; Plut., *Cic.*, 12.

<sup>97</sup> Plut., *loc. cit.*

<sup>98</sup> Cic., *De Leg. Agr.*, II. 7, 16 and 18; 8, 21; 12, 31.

<sup>99</sup> Cic., *op. cit.*, I. 1, 1; I. 5, 16; II. 17, 44 and 46.

Their powers were very extensive, including the right to sell the *ager publicus* in Italy, Syria, and Pompey's recent conquests, to exercise judicial authority, to confiscate lands, to found colonies, to receive funds from the treasury, and to enroll and maintain as many soldiers as they required.<sup>100</sup> They were also to be provided with two hundred aides from the equestrian order.<sup>101</sup> It was also suspected that the backers of this measure intended to stretch their authority over Egypt, on the pretext of the will of King Alexander.<sup>102</sup>

The effect of this measure would have been to place in the hands of the ten commissioners an *imperium* or military command effective both in Italy and in the provinces, backed by an unlimited army, the maintenance of which was guaranteed by the revenues they would control, and supported by the right of civil jurisdiction. The military character of this board was but thinly veiled by its nominal duty of disposing of the public land. However, the attack upon the Senate's prerogative of administering the latter, as well as the general mistrust of the purposes of such a measure, caused such a strong opposition that its sponsors recognized their defeat without bringing the matter to a vote.

The most striking change that appears in this period with regard to the extraordinary commands is that the Comitia asserted and made good its right to create such commands. Not only this, but it also exercised the power of enlarging the sphere of an *imperium* already established, in conferring upon Pompey the command against Mithradates in addition to that against the pirates. From another point of view this action is the exercise of the right to depose a senatorial commander and transfer his command to another officer already in the field. It is true that the actual appointment was still made by the Senate, but the Comitia defined the number and the qualifications of the appointees. In the case of the proposed land commission, the members were to have been elected, but here there was no violation of precedent, for this commission could claim to be of the same character as the *Illviri agris assignandis dandis* created in 133 B. C., who were elected by the Comitia. The unusual feature here was the clothing of such commissioners with military authority, which gave them an extraordinary *imperium*.

The bitter opposition which the Senate offered to the Gabinian law<sup>103</sup> shows that they regarded it as a violation of senatorial rights,

<sup>100</sup> Cic., *op. cit.*, II. 15; Plut., *Cic.*, 12.

<sup>101</sup> Plut., *loc. cit.*

<sup>102</sup> Cic., *De Leg. Agr.*, I. 1, 1; 2, 16, 41; II. 17, 44.

<sup>103</sup> Dio, XXXVI. 23 ff.



and saw in it a deathblow to the retention of the control of the extraordinary commands in the hands of the Senate.

The command of Pompey in 67 was limited to three years, and the proposed land commission was to hold power for five. Thus we find that the idea had developed of fixing a definite limit for the duration of such commands. This is perhaps an indication that the extraordinary *imperia* were coming to be looked upon as promagistracies and, like these, tenable for definite terms only. However, it may be simply a proof that the idea of an *imperium* unlimited in time was beginning to cause wide-spread suspicion and alarm.

The history of the second decade following the death of Sulla is dominated by the personality of Pompey, and there can be no doubt that his aims were the determining factors in the creation of the extraordinary commands of the time. His policy seems to have aimed at securing for himself the conduct of all important military operations carried on by the Roman state, and to leave no opportunities for rivals to acquire military renown. Seeing that the Senate would not fall in with his views, he turned to the popular party. By restoring to the tribunate the power of initiating legislation he both won the support of the *populares* and made the tribunate an instrument for carrying out his ideas.<sup>104</sup> Thus it was the alliance of the general and the demagogue which wrested from the Senate the control of the extraordinary commands. But what this method could accomplish for one commander, it could also accomplish for his rival, as the following years were to show.<sup>105</sup>

### III. THE RIVAL COMMANDS OF POMPEY, CAESAR, AND CRASSUS, 60-48 B. C.

#### (a) *Caesar's Command in Gaul, 59 B. C.*

The election of Julius Caesar to the consulship for the year 59, one of the fruits of the informal coalition known as the First Triumvirate, was a direct, if not immediately recognized, challenge of the position which Pompey had held during the previous decade.

The opportunity to lay a firm basis for his future career came

<sup>104</sup> Plut., *Pomp.*, 25, indicates collusion between Pompey and Gabinius; Dio, XXXVI. 23, 24, suggests the same, although admitting that Gabinius may have acted from a desire to curry favor with Pompey.

<sup>105</sup> Perhaps a word should be said regarding the command of Metellus against the Cretans (68-67 B. C.). This has not been treated as an extraordinary command, for it was a regular proconsular *provincia*. It was one of the provinces assigned by the Senate for the consuls of 69, and for which the latter drew lots. Hortensius obtained this as his province, but withdrew in favor of his colleague Metellus, who left Italy for Crete in 68 (Xiphil., p. 3, R. Steph.; Drumann-Gr., II. 42).



to Caesar through the death of Q. Metellus Celer, the proconsul of Cisalpine Gaul, in February, 59 B. C.,<sup>106</sup> when there was prospect of a war breaking out in Transalpine Gaul in the near future.<sup>107</sup> The Senate, in accordance with the Sempronian law, had allotted the consular provinces for 58 already. According to Suetonius,<sup>108</sup> these were *silvae collesque*, spheres where no opportunity could arise to make the proconsuls dangerous to the Senate's authority. It was necessary to pass a special law to effect any change in these arrangements. And so Caesar secured the passing of the Lex Vatinia, which created for him an extraordinary command, including the vacant province of Cisalpine Gaul and thus involving the conduct of operations in case of any movement among the Gauls.<sup>109</sup> A *senatus consultum*, which sanctioned this law, increased the powers conferred by the latter.<sup>110</sup>

The Lex Vatinia, which was carried by a display of armed force on the part of Pompey,<sup>111</sup> gave Caesar the command of Illyricum and Cisalpine Gaul for a term of five years, with a garrison of three legions.<sup>112</sup> The *senatus consultum*, passed on a motion of Pompey, added Transalpine Gaul and one legion.<sup>113</sup> This command, as we have seen, extended for a period of five years. Therefore, since it terminated on March 1, 54 B. C.,<sup>114</sup> it must have been reckoned from March 1, 59, and for the rest of the year 59 must have run concurrently with Caesar's consulship.<sup>115</sup>

The *senatus consultum* also gave Caesar the right to appoint *legati* at his discretion,<sup>116</sup> possibly of propraetorian rank,<sup>117</sup> and granted him money from the *aerarium* for his expenses.<sup>118</sup>

<sup>106</sup> Cic., *Pro Caelio*, 24, 59.

<sup>107</sup> Cic., *De Divinatione*, II. 41, 90; *Ad Att.*, I. 19, 2.

<sup>108</sup> *Jul.*, 19, 2.

<sup>109</sup> Suet., *Jul.*, 22, 1; Dio, XXXVIII. 8, 5.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>111</sup> Dio, XXXVII. 57, 2; Plut., *Caes.*, 14; Zonaras, X. 6.

<sup>112</sup> Suet., *Jul.*, 22, 1; Dio, XXXVIII. 8, 5; App., *B. C.*, II. 13; Plut., *Caes.*, 14, 6; *Pomp.*, 48, 3; *Cato Min.*, 33, 3; Vell. Pat., II. 44, 5; Oros., VI. 7, 1, giving seven legions; Eutrop., VI. 17, 1, ten legions; Zon., *loc. cit.*; all fail to distinguish the two separate conferments.

<sup>113</sup> Cic., *Ad Att.*, VIII. 3, 3; Suet., *loc. cit.*; Dio, *loc. cit.*; Oros., *loc. cit.* This included the Roman province later known as Gallia Narbonensis, Caesar, *B. G.*, I. 10, 5; VII. 1; VII. 6, 1, etc.; Liv., *Per.*, 103; cf. Jullian, *Histoire de la Gaule*, III. 190; T. Rice Holmes, *Conquest of Gaul* (1899), pp. 21, 195, 823.

<sup>114</sup> Cic., *De Prov. Cons.*, 15.

<sup>115</sup> Hirschfeld, in *Klio*, IV. 176 (1904).

<sup>116</sup> Cic., *De Prov. Cons.*, 17, 42; *In Vat.*, 15, 36.

<sup>117</sup> E. G., Labienus, *Caes.*, *B. G.*, I. 21; cf. Momm., *Staatsr.*, vol. II., pt. 1, p. 657, note 1.

<sup>118</sup> Cic., *Ad Fam.*, I. 7, 10.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIV.—2.

Throughout the year 59 Caesar held the *imperium consulare*, but after his abdication of the consulship on December 31 of that year, his *imperium* was *pro consule*.

In 56 B. C. there was held the conference of Pompey, Caesar, and Crassus at Luca, which resulted in the extension of Caesar's command in Gaul and the extraordinary provincial commands of the two other members of this triumvirate.<sup>119</sup>

This prorogation of Caesar's *imperium* was granted by a law introduced by Pompey during the latter's second consulship, 55 B. C.<sup>120</sup> The prorogation went into effect upon the expiration of the first term on March 1, 54. For the purpose of this study it is of no importance whether we consider that the duration of Caesar's second term was three<sup>121</sup> or five years,<sup>122</sup> or hold that no definite time limit was set, but only a provision introduced forbidding the discussion of the appointment of his successor prior to March 1, 50 B. C.<sup>123</sup>

(b) *The Command of Crassus in Syria and the East, 55 B. C.*

One of the fruits of the conference of Luca was the election of Pompey and Crassus to the consulate for 55, and their subsequent appointment to proconsular commands which in importance rivalled Caesar's command of 59.<sup>124</sup>

During their consulship the tribune Gaius Trebonius, at their instigation, introduced a law which took the definition of their proconsular commands out of the hands of the Senate and created two extraordinary commands for which the consuls subsequently drew lots.<sup>125</sup> This law met with bitter opposition from Cato and the senatorial faction, and was only passed after a considerable display of force.

The command which fell to the lot of Crassus included Syria and the war against the Parthians, with some authority over the adjacent provinces.<sup>126</sup> It was to last for five years, and gave him power to

<sup>119</sup> App., B. C., II. 17; Suet., Jul., 24; Plut., Pomp., 51-52; Caes., 21; Crass., 14, 15.

<sup>120</sup> Vell. Pat., II. 46: "lege quam Pompeius ad populum tulit".

<sup>121</sup> Dio, XXXIX. 33.

<sup>122</sup> Vell. Pat., II. 46; Suet., Jul., 24; Plut., Pomp., 51-52; Caes., 21; Crass., 15; App., B. C., II. 17, 63; II. 18, 65; and possibly Cic., Phil., II. 10, 24; Ad Att., VII. 6, 2; Holzapfel, in *Klio*, IV. 327 f.; V. 107 f.

<sup>123</sup> Hirschfeld, in *Klio*, IV. 75 ff.

<sup>124</sup> Suet., Jul., 24; Plut., Pomp., 51; Cato Min., 41.

<sup>125</sup> Liv., Per., 105; Plut., Pomp., 52; Cato Min., 43; Crass., 15; Dio, XXXIX. 33, 2.

<sup>126</sup> *Locc. cit.*; and App., B. C., II. 18, 65; Dio, XXXIX. 33, 2; Crassus also had some designs on Egypt, Plut., Cato Min., 43.

raise armies of citizens and allies at will, to maintain naval forces, and to make war and peace with whomsoever he chose.

As with Caesar in 59, Crassus's command for part of the year 55 ran concurrently with his consulship, for Crassus left Rome for his province in the course of that year.<sup>127</sup>

We shall see that the province which fell to the lot of Pompey was no less important than that of Crassus.

*(c) Pompey's Curatorship of the Corn Supply, 57 B. C.*

Although Pompey received the *cura annonae* in 57 B. C., I have postponed the discussion of it until after taking up the commands of Caesar and Crassus so as to trace more clearly the concentration of offices in Pompey's hands up to 52 B. C.

The inadequate arrangements for the maintenance of a regular grain supply for the city of Rome had resulted in a famine in 57.<sup>128</sup> The clamors of the mob induced the consuls to propose a law to entrust Pompey with the control of the grain traffic throughout the Roman world.<sup>129</sup> A rival measure, introduced by one Messius, would have conferred far greater powers upon him, but the former proposal, supported by Cicero, became law.<sup>130</sup>

By this law Pompey received the *cura annonae*, which Cicero<sup>131</sup> describes as "omnis potestas rei frumentariae toto orbe terrarum", and which included the control of the ports, the markets, and the traffic in grain within the Roman dominions.<sup>132</sup>

His term of office was fixed at five years,<sup>133</sup> and he had the right to appoint fifteen *legati*.<sup>134</sup> Within Italy and without he exercised an *imperium pro consule*,<sup>135</sup> which, in the provinces, was equivalent to the old *imperium infinitum aequum* which he had enjoyed in 67.<sup>136</sup>

Previously, Roman grain commissioners had lacked military authority, and probably in this case also the *cura annonae* was meant to be essentially a "food dictatorship". But, owing to the military

<sup>127</sup> Plut., *Pomp.*, 52.

<sup>128</sup> Dio, XXXIX. 9, 2; Plut., *Pomp.*, 49.

<sup>129</sup> Dio, *loc. cit.*; Cic., *Ad Att.*, IV. 1, 6, 7. Pompey was now reconciled with the Senate and Cicero.

<sup>130</sup> Cic., *loc. cit.*

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>132</sup> Plut., *Pomp.*, 49; Dio, XXXIX. 9.

<sup>133</sup> Liv., *Per.*, 104: "Cn. Pompeio per quinquennium annonae cura mandata est".

<sup>134</sup> Cic., *Ad Att.*, IV. 1, 6, 7. Cicero was the first appointed.

<sup>135</sup> Dio, XXXIX. 9.

<sup>136</sup> Messius had proposed "maius imperium, omnem pecuniae potestatem", a fleet, and an army. Cic., *Ad Att.*, IV. 1, 7.

power which it conferred, in Pompey's hands it became really an extraordinary command. There can scarcely be any doubt that Pompey, who was then without office or command, regarded it as an opportunity to acquire once more the military *imperium*, for the powers which he received were practically dictated by himself. His supporters looked upon this office in the same way and favored the proposal of Messius, which would have given Pompey the *maius imperium* in the provinces.<sup>137</sup>

(d) *The Command of Pompey in Spain and Africa, 55 B. C.*

The circumstances which attended Pompey's appointment to his extraordinary provincial command in 55 B. C. have been recounted in connection with the command of Crassus received at the same time.

By the Trebonian law of that year Pompey received Libya and the two Spanish provinces, with four legions.<sup>138</sup> His command commenced in 55 B. C. and ran for five years, and he had the same powers to raise armies from citizens and allies, to maintain naval forces, and to make war and peace, that Crassus enjoyed.<sup>139</sup> But, in addition, Pompey was granted the privilege of remaining in Italy after the expiration of his consulship and of governing his provinces through *legati*.<sup>140</sup> This concession was made probably on account of his duties in connection with the *cura annonae*.

This provincial command did not lapse until 51, but in 52, while in control of affairs at Rome, Pompey secured for himself an extension of it for another five years,<sup>141</sup> in imitation of the prorogation of Caesar's *imperium* in 55.

(e) *The Position of Pompey in 52 B. C.*

In the year 52 B. C. Pompey reached the height of his official career. He was appointed sole consul to check the disorders in the city with which the Senate and the regular magistrates had proved unable to cope, and which had prevented the holding of the elections for the consulship of that year.<sup>142</sup>

Pompey was appointed by an *interrex*, in accordance with a decree of the Senate.<sup>143</sup> The idea had been entertained of making

<sup>137</sup> Cic., *loc. cit.*; cf. Momms., *Staatsr.* vol. II., pt. 1, p. 672.

<sup>138</sup> Liv., *Per.*, 105; App., *B. C.*, II. 18, 65; Plut., *Pomp.*, 52; Crass., 15; Caes., 28; Cato *Min.*, 43; Dio, XXXIX. 33.

<sup>139</sup> *Locc. cit.*

<sup>140</sup> Plut., *Pomp.*, 53; Crass., 16; Cato *Min.*, 45.

<sup>141</sup> Plut., *Caes.*, 28, 5; *Pomp.*, 55 (four years); Dio, XL. 56, 2.

<sup>142</sup> Liv., *Per.*, 107; Dio, XL. 49, 50, 1; Plut., *Pomp.*, 54.

<sup>143</sup> Suet., *Jul.*, 26; Plut., *loc. cit.*; Cato *Min.*, 47; Dio, *loc. cit.*

Pompey a dictator, but it had been abandoned owing to the opposition of Cato.<sup>144</sup> However, there was but little more than a difference of title between the two positions, for, as Appian says,<sup>145</sup> he had the ἐξουσίαν δικτάτορος, ἄρχων μόνος, τὴν δ' εὐθυναν ὑπάτου. The twenty-four lictors bearing axes within the *pomerium* and the exemption from being called to account for his conduct were all that Pompey lacked of the dictator's powers. As the dictator could choose his *magister equitum*, so Pompey was given the privilege of nominating a colleague after two months, if he so desired, with the sole restriction that this colleague should not be Caesar.<sup>146</sup> This was the first sole consulship in Roman history.<sup>147</sup> And Pompey's appointment to it was a violation of the law regulating re-election to the consulship, for, as he had been consul in 55, he was ineligible to hold that office again before 45 B. C.

At the same time, Pompey was still in enjoyment of his control of the *cura annonae* and his extraordinary provincial command. And in this year he received a grant of one thousand talents annually from the *aerarium* for the upkeep of his legions.<sup>148</sup>

(f) *Pompey's Status from 52 to 48 B. C.*

Pompey's *cura annonae* lapsed in the course of the year 52 B. C., and his consulship terminated at the close of the same year. However, he still possessed his proconsular command and retained the privilege of remaining in Italy.<sup>149</sup> This proconsular status he retained until his death in 48, for his second term of office was not to terminate until the end of 47.

However, in 49 Pompey received additional authority. The *senatus consultum ultimum* of January 7 authorized the consuls, praetors, tribunes of the plebs, and whatever proconsuls might be at Rome, to see to it that no harm overtook the state.<sup>150</sup> Of course Pompey was included among the proconsuls who were in the vicinity of Rome.<sup>151</sup> In addition to this general commission, he received specific authority from the consuls to march against Caesar with the army then at Capua and elsewhere in Italy, besides such additional

<sup>144</sup> Plut., *Caes.*, 28, 5.

<sup>145</sup> B. C., II. 23, 84.

<sup>146</sup> Plut., *Pomp.*, 54; Dio, XL. 50, 4.

<sup>147</sup> Liv., *Per.*, 107; Dio, XL. 50, 5.

<sup>148</sup> Plut., *Pomp.*, 55; Dio, XI. 56, 2.

<sup>149</sup> Plut., *Pomp.*, 55.

<sup>150</sup> Caes., *B. C.*, I. 5: "dent operam consules, praetores, tribuni plebis, quique consulares sunt ad urbem, ne quid respublica detrimenti capiat"; Dio, XLI. 3.

<sup>151</sup> Liv., *Per.*, 109: "mandatum est a senatu consulibus et Cn. Pompeio, ut viderent, ne quid respublica detrimenti caperet".

troops as he might raise.<sup>152</sup> Further, the Senate authorized him to raise 130,000 troops in Italy, besides contingents from the allies of Rome, and to use all the public resources and accept private contributions for military purposes.<sup>153</sup>

Throughout the campaign against Caesar Pompey conducted himself as the nominal subordinate of the consuls, for their *imperium* was higher than his,<sup>154</sup> but, actually, owing to his military experience and prestige, he was in supreme command of the Senate's forces.<sup>155</sup>

From the above consideration of the *Leges Vatinia*, *Trebonia*, and *Pompeia* we see that after 60 B. C. the *Comitia* exercised an undisputed right to create extraordinary commands and to confer them upon whomsoever it pleased. The Senate merely confirmed the action of the *Comitia*, or, as in the case of the *Lex Vatinia*, increased the powers thus conferred. The exercise of this right by the *Comitia* involved a repeated usurpation of the Senate's control over the assignment of the provinces, especially those designated as consular in successive years. This had previously occurred for the benefit of Marius in 107 B. C., but in 74 it was the Senate alone which had rearranged the provincial assignments in the interests of Lucullus and Cotta.

With the exception of the *imperium infinitum aequum* revived by the *cura annonae*, the extraordinary commands of this period took the form of special proconsular governorships, embracing several regular provinces and extending for a term of five years.<sup>156</sup> They found their model in Lucullus's command of 74 B. C., although this lacked the definite time-limit. Such commands, once created, could be extended by the same authority that established them, namely a law of the *Comitia*.

Finally, we have seen that Pompey had proved unable to retain a monopoly of the important extraordinary commands. The path by which he had advanced to his commands of the preceding decade was open to others also, and Julius Caesar obtained his command in Gaul through the support of the tribunate and the city populace.

In this way, as we have seen, between 80 and 48 B. C. the extraordinary command developed from an unusual to a regular feature of Rome's imperial government. And along with this development

<sup>152</sup> App., *B. C.*, II. 31.

<sup>153</sup> App., *B. C.*, II. 34; Dio, XLI. 3.

<sup>154</sup> *E. g.*, App., *B. C.*, II. 36; Dio, XLI. 12.

<sup>155</sup> Dio, XLI. 43, 5.

<sup>156</sup> Mommsen has pointed out that the *Lex Vatinia* was the first law to extend a proconsular command beyond one year and at the same time to limit it definitely, *Staatsr.*, I. 596.

there arose the following characteristic ideas associated with the extraordinary *imperium*: the extension of the military command for longer than annual periods, the grouping of several ordinary provinces under one *imperium*, the absence of the holder of such a command from his *provincia* and the delegation of his authority to lieutenants, the exercise of the supreme command at sea in the form of the *imperium infinitum*, and the existence of a general *imperium maius* outside of the regular magistracies. All these ideas, as Mommsen<sup>157</sup> points out, find expression in the organization of the Principate.

#### IV. POMPEY THE FORERUNNER OF AUGUSTUS

From 28 to 23 B. C. the power of Augustus was based upon (1) the consulship, held annually, and (2) an *imperium consulare* granted for ten years. His *provincia* included one-half of the Roman provinces and all the armed forces of Rome, on land and sea alike. Thus he held the chief magistracy in the city and, at the same time, had an *imperium infinitum*, which was superior (*maius*) to that of all proconsuls and praetors, for he wielded this *imperium* as a consul.<sup>158</sup> In other words, Augustus was consul and held an extraordinary command besides. This latter because of its extent and its continuity made him the real ruler of the state, for it vested in him alone the supreme command of the Roman armies.

Now, as we have seen, at two separate moments in his career Pompey succeeded in procuring for himself powers almost equal to those of Augustus. In 66 B. C., by virtue of the Gabinian and Manilian laws, he possessed an *imperium* effective over the sea and its shores for fifty miles inland and over the provinces in the region affected by the Mithradatic War. This gave him the control of practically all the armed forces of Rome outside of Italy.<sup>159</sup> But his power was restricted by the limitation of his command at sea to three years, and by the fact that he held no official position at Rome. Further, he held his *imperium pro consule*, and thus it was an *imperium aequum* with respect to the provincial governors.

In 52 B. C. Pompey had even greater power concentrated in his hands. He was consul (for a time sole consul), and had a *provincia* embracing Spain, Libya, and the sphere assigned to him with the *cura annonae*. In this year his *imperium* was no longer *aequum* but *maius*, for he exercised it as consul. Further, he had the same right as

<sup>157</sup> Staatsr., II. 662.

<sup>158</sup> Pelham, "The Imperium of Augustus", *Essays*, pp. 60-71.

<sup>159</sup> App., *B. M.*, 97: στρατιάς τε πάσης, ὅση πέραν ἐστὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας, ἀρχεῖν ἔδωκεν.



Augustus to govern his provinces through *legati* of his own appointment. His provincial command extended for two periods of five years, and in 52 his *cura annonae* lapsed after one such term. Consequently his contemporaries justly referred to him as the First Citizen (*princeps*).<sup>160</sup>

Thus we see that the position of Augustus between 28 and 23 B. C. was not much more than a continuation of the status of Pompey in 52. The essential differences were this very continuity and the wider scope of the *imperium* of Augustus, which made him the commander-in-chief of all the armed forces of Rome. The permanence of his power was in this way practically assured. His *imperium*, however, like that of Pompey, was conferred for a definite term only, by the Senate and the Comitia,<sup>161</sup> the source of Pompey's power.

From 23 B. C. until his death in 14 A. D., the main props of the authority of Augustus were (1) his extraordinary *imperium*, held for successive terms, and (2) the *tribunicia potestas*, which he had held before but which he had not emphasized, in view of the fact that he had been consul each year.<sup>162</sup> When he resigned the consulship in that year, he made good the loss of power thus incurred at Rome, by bringing into play the *tribunicia potestas*, supplemented by certain privileges added by laws of the next few years. But when he ceased to be consul his *imperium* was no longer the *maius imperium*, for, being held *pro consule* only, it no longer outranked that of the proconsular governors. Hence special laws were passed defining his *imperium* as *maius* and effective within the city as well as without.<sup>163</sup> This restored to Augustus the consular *imperium* which he had held from 28 to 23.<sup>164</sup> This *imperium* was renewed in 18 and 13 B. C. for five-year periods; in 8 B. C., 3 A. D., and 13 A. D. for ten-year terms.<sup>165</sup>

Thus we see that the *imperium infinitum maius*, which was the true basis of the power of the Princeps, was not the creation of Augustus. It was Pompey's goal in his endeavor to establish himself as the permanent commander-in-chief of the Roman armies. For a short time in 52 B. C. it was almost within his grasp, but he never obtained it in its fullness. Brutus and Cassius had it con-

<sup>160</sup> Cic., *Ad. Fam.*, I. 9, 11 (December, 54).

<sup>161</sup> Pelham, *Essays*, p. 60, note 3; cf. Momm., *Staatsr.*, vol. II., pt. 2, p. 745, note 2.

<sup>162</sup> Pelham, *Essays*, p. 71 ff.

<sup>163</sup> Dio, LIII. 32.

<sup>164</sup> Pelham, *Essays*, p. 71 ff.

<sup>165</sup> Pelham, p. 60 ff.



ferred upon them by the Senate in the crisis of 43/2 B. C.<sup>166</sup> But it was left for Augustus to develop it as the solution of the military problem of the empire with which the senatorial régime had failed to cope. It was characteristic of Augustus that he should thus convert into one of the pillars of the Principate a power which had the sanction of constitutionality and to which the Senate itself had had resort in the struggle to maintain its prerogatives.

A. E. R. BOAK.

<sup>166</sup> App., *B. C.*, IV. 58; cf. Momm., *Staatsr.*, II. 655.

## THE UNITED STATES AND THE ABORTIVE ARMED NEUTRALITY OF 1794

ASIDE from the great issues between the belligerents, nothing has been more strongly forced upon international attention by the present war than the increasingly difficult position in which neutral states find themselves between the two groups of antagonists reeling at grips across the face of the world. Economic, national, and imperial interests have impelled the great belligerents to form their own systems for the preservation of their lives; only when a neutral is able to present power behind its behests are the mighty combatants of world wars likely to depart enough from their own considerations to give heed to its demands. The history of American neutrality from 1914 to 1917 will remain one of the greatest illustrations of this fact.

On two familiar occasions in the past, neutral nations who have seen their interests injured and unheeded by belligerents in world wars have adopted a joint defense by threat of armed force as a means of obtaining what they deemed their rights, short of actually entering war. Such a combination has been successful according to the degree of force that has been behind it, and according to the degree in which the interests of the united neutrals have coincided.

In the First Armed Neutrality, of 1780-1783, to which the United States was a party, the alliance of neutrals to enforce enlightened principles of international law was sufficiently numerous, sufficiently unified in interests, and sufficiently strong to force Great Britain to much greater prudence, and to a mitigation of the severity of her prize laws.<sup>1</sup> It constituted one element in the forces balancing against the United Kingdom that induced British statesmen to come to terms with America.<sup>2</sup> The Second Armed Neutrality, of 1800, including Sweden, Denmark, Russia, and Prussia, was not strong enough to prevent the collapse of Denmark under the guns of Nelson. Skillful British diplomacy playing on the divergent interests of the neutral allies, the bombardment of Copenhagen, and the death of the Tsar Paul, shattered that neutral combination before it attained sufficient momentum to influence materially the naval policy of Great Britain.

<sup>1</sup> Kleen, *Lois et Usages de la Neutralité*, I. 20 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> Van Tyne, *American Revolution*, p. 328.

Not much mention has ever been made of the beginnings of another armed neutrality that threatened British naval control in a manner equally dangerous, in the year 1794. It is interesting to students of American history, because the relation of the United States to it shows how the action of small belligerents in the face of all-powerful opponents is dictated thoroughly by the interests of self-preservation, just as deviations from accepted principles of international law on the part of great belligerents are frequently dictated—and always explained—by the same motives. It is interesting, again, because the decision then taken by the government of the United States to abstain from such an alliance, and to acquiesce in the principal British interpretations of sea law, marks the first conscious and official embarkation on a policy which remained the pole-star of American foreign relations until the vastly altered conditions of 1917—the policy of abstention from entangling alliances.

Great Britain's entrance, in February, 1793, into the European conflagration precipitated by the French Revolution, extended that great conflict of political antagonisms beyond the marches and countermarches of Continental armies. Republican legions of France successfully met the threat of Pillnitz and the manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick, but the regenerated vigor of revolutionary warfare found indomitable opposition in the British sea power and the controlling diplomacy that worked hand in hand with it. To sweep the tricolor from the seas, and by choking the commerce of France so to impede the effectiveness of her armies as to force them to yield to those of the Coalition, was the policy of Great Britain. With the development of this maritime policy neutral nations saw themselves seriously injured by the increasingly arbitrary Orders in Council and the wholly one-sided decisions of the admiralty courts. Great Britain did not propose for one minute that the protection of a neutral flag should nullify her naval might.

Though strong, British sea power was not at the beginning of the war omnipotent. The diplomacy of Downing Street was therefore directed in the spring and summer of 1794 toward bolstering by treaties and alliances the naval power of the empire. First fruit of this masterful foreign policy was the treaty with Russia, in which both powers agreed to stop all exports of military supplies or provisions to French ports and frankly acknowledged the purpose of taking "all other measures for injuring the commerce of France" and preventing neutrals from giving protection to it on the high seas. In quick succession there followed a series of measures of like consequence. Spain acceded to a similar arrangement on May 25. The

first Orders in Council came, June 8, to bring into British harbors all provisions found on board neutral ships bound for French ports, whether these ports were blockaded or not.<sup>3</sup> The Two Sicilies (July 12), Prussia (July 14), Austria (August 30), and Portugal (September 26) acknowledged in treaties with Great Britain the same determination to annihilate the commerce of the new republic.<sup>4</sup> French armies withstood valiantly the blows of Europe armed against them. The reborn vigor that never fails France delivered counter-strokes of more than equal weight. Yet the rulers of the Revolution saw the British naval-diplomatic system engulfing the principal monarchies of Europe, and British fighting vessels everywhere threatening arbitrary control of all other powers.

France by the autumn of 1793 saw herself almost completely encircled by the constricting coils of the power that controls the sea. The diplomatic representatives of Russia and Great Britain had informed the monarchs of Sweden and Denmark that British and Russian fleets would be stationed in the Baltic and North seas to stop all kinds of provisions bound for France under whatever flag.<sup>5</sup> If the plan were carried out successfully, the English had succeeded in blocking the Baltic to France by extending contraband to cover not only naval-store products of that region, so necessary to the French navy, but the great supplies of food that the Swedes and Danes sent through the Sounds to the impoverished republic. The same prohibitions confronted vessels from America. They were forced to land their masts and barrels of tar and pitch on British wharves, and to empty their cargoes of grain into the bins of British warehouses. Except for the Baltic Scandinavian ports, a few Italian harbors, and the cities of the Levant, all Europe and America, as a result of the British system, was closing to the ships of the new republican flag.

<sup>3</sup> "That it shall be lawful to stop and detain all vessels loaded wholly or in part with corn, flour, or meal, bound to any port of France, or any port occupied by the armies of France, and to send them to such ports as shall be convenient, in order that such corn, meal, or flour may be purchased on behalf of His Majesty's Government, and the ships be released after such purchase, and after a due allowance for freight, or that the masters of such ships, on giving due security, to be approved by the court of admiralty, be permitted to proceed to dispose of their cargoes of corn, meal, or flour, in the ports of any country in amity with His Majesty." *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, I. 240.

<sup>4</sup> For text of these treaties see *Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, I. 243 (for Russia); for Prussia, Austria, Spain, the Two Sicilies, and Portugal, see *Parliamentary History*, XXX. 1053-1058. Portugal and the Two Sicilies, however, did not accept the provision concerning neutrals.

<sup>5</sup> For text of notes see *Annual Register*, 1794, p. 241.

Among those nations still upholding the more liberal interpretations of international law lingering from the First Armed Neutrality remained only Sweden, Denmark, feeble Poland (now already slipping into the grasp of the three partitioners), and Turkey. The United States, to be sure, had incorporated these principles in its first treaties and had made formal protest against the Orders in Council of June 8;<sup>6</sup> but the protests were fortified only by paragraphs from Pufendorf and Vattel. The relentless pressure of naval power had made them only perfunctory. The British ministry had been careful to feel out the attitude of the American administration toward any such proceeding before the Orders were issued. Alexander Hamilton, the most influential and cogent of the advisers of Washington, for five years had been in confidential communication with the British minister, George Hammond, and with Major George Beckwith, in an informal sense his predecessor.<sup>7</sup> He quietly assured Hammond that he saw the justice behind the Orders in Council, though he was not able to answer for the opinions of his colleagues.<sup>8</sup> As a result, the British Foreign Office paid only polite attention to the protests penned so assiduously by Jefferson, secretary of state.<sup>9</sup> Even along the thinly populated shores of the coast of northern Africa the pressure made itself felt; there lurked the sea-harpies of the Mediterranean, the Barbary pirates, whose corsairs, released by British mediation from a war with Portugal,<sup>10</sup> were free to prey on such French vessels as might slip past hostile cruisers on the voyage to Venice and the Levant. Both in the old and in the new world the remorseless force of the enemy's sea power threatened to strangle the commercial life of France.

With this aggressive diplomatic and naval system threatening to neutralize all the valor of the armies of France, the revolutionary executives strove to achieve some effective opposing combination. There was one obvious possibility. Encroachments and restrictions on neutral trade struck vitally at the prosperity of the Scandinavian

<sup>6</sup> *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, I. 241, 449-454.

<sup>7</sup> The confidential relations of Hamilton with the British representatives at Philadelphia may be seen clearly in the correspondence of those representatives with the Foreign Office. See Record Office, Foreign Office, America, ser. 4, vol. 12 for Beckwith correspondence; vols. 13-16 for Hammond correspondence.

<sup>8</sup> Hammond to Grenville, Philadelphia, May 17, 1793. R. O., F. O., ser. 5, vol. 1. Where there is not specifically mentioned in these notes the name of some other state, in parenthesis, it is to be understood that citations of these volumes of Foreign Office Correspondence refer to America. Record Office, Foreign Office Papers, is abbreviated as R. O., F. O. See *List of Indexes to Foreign Office Records* (London, 1914).

<sup>9</sup> Grenville to Hammond, January 11, 1794. R. O., F. O., ser. 5, vol. 4.

<sup>10</sup> *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, I. 288.

nations, whose flags in war-times obviously would cover great profits, but who depended even in times of peace on the business of the carrying trade. They followed that impulse which is almost an instinct with small nations that have large merchant marines but small fighting navies. The two northern monarchies, whose interests led them to adopt more liberal principles of the law of nations, protested vigorously against the British provision order. Their protest brought nothing but chagrin. Neither kingdom could undertake resistance by force. Sweden, lacking funds to equip a half-dozen ships-of-the-line, had the dangerous Finnish and Pomeranian frontiers and little real strength to guard them. Denmark was clamped in a vice, the jaws of which were the British and Russian navies.

French diplomats, however, saw in the Baltic a chance to offset the system of the English. It consisted in resurrecting the armed neutrality of the previous war. Soon after matters had begun to adjust themselves to British participation in the conflict, a French agent had accompanied to Stockholm the Baron de Staël, Swedish minister in France, in an effort to induce the two powers of the north to unite in a new armed neutrality. But the Regent of Sweden—with an eye always to his threatened frontiers—had desired a permanent alliance; and France, already launched on the successful campaign of 1793, did not regard with much enthusiasm the few equivalents which Sweden, diplomatically and geographically isolated, could offer for such an alliance.<sup>11</sup>

These early negotiations withered away, but the French continued to give sharp attention to the Baltic and to the possibility of concerted action by Sweden and Denmark in the face of England. A French agent, Philippe de Grouvelle, was vested with the powers of minister plenipotentiary in the summer of 1793 and sent to Copenhagen as representative of the French republic. He had instructions to keep Denmark and Sweden united diplomatically in defense of their neutral rights as interpreted by themselves, and if possible to stimulate the two courts to a real joint alliance in favor of France.<sup>12</sup> Grouvelle soon found that France had a common grievance with the Baltic Powers because of the British and Russian notes, above referred to, and he had no difficulty in establishing himself on the most friendly terms with the Count von Bernstorff, royal Danish chancellor.<sup>13</sup> In the face of the monarchs allied against

<sup>11</sup> Rapport au Comité de Salut Public, Suède et Dannemarck, 16 Floréal, an II. (May 5, 1794). Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Suède, vol. 286, pp. 224-227.

<sup>12</sup> Grouvelle au Ministre des Affaires Étrangères, Copenhagen, September 10, 1793. Arch. Aff. Étrang., Dannemarck, vol. 169, p. 245.

<sup>13</sup> Grouvelle au Ministre des Affaires Étrangères, Hamburg, August 14, 1793. *Ibid.*, vol. 169, p. 213.

France, Bernstorff did not quite dare to receive Grouvelle as the official representative of the revolutionary French republic.<sup>14</sup> Nevertheless, he had frequent and intimate conferences with him and for all practical purposes Grouvelle had the status and influence of French ambassador. He made arrangements for the quicker and more lucrative disposal of French prizes brought into Norwegian harbors, brought forward proposals for a new commercial treaty, supplied the Committee of Public Safety with such information as he had gleaned from the chancellor concerning the belligerent courts—then, as now, neutral Denmark was a great clearing-house for European war news, and Bernstorff was best informed of all diplomats—and above all pushed his proposals for joint armed neutrality of Sweden and Denmark.<sup>15</sup>

Bernstorff asserted to Grouvelle that complete confidence and unanimity as to policy prevailed between Denmark and Sweden, but refused to make any definite promises.<sup>16</sup> He said that such a proposal for a joint armament had been made by Denmark to Sweden. It was soon hinted by Erenheim, Swedish minister at Copenhagen, that Sweden's delay in preparing any armament to be used in possible co-operation with Denmark was due to poverty—a French subsidy to help Sweden to maintain her armed neutrality would be useful and proper.<sup>17</sup> The French Minister of Foreign Affairs thought such an investment unwise on the ground that commercial privileges offered by France would be sufficient stimulus for such an armed neutrality; the interest of Denmark and Sweden, Grouvelle was instructed,<sup>18</sup> would be sufficient to induce them to combine forces against Russia and England. Grouvelle wrote back that though apparently steps were being taken by the Scandinavians to preserve neutrality by separate action, he did not think such inducements would suffice to maintain a joint alliance.<sup>19</sup>

Meanwhile plans were being made in Paris to expand the possibilities of a Baltic armed neutrality into a grandiose combination. There is a memorandum of the plan in the library of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Committee of Public Safety

<sup>14</sup> Same to same. *Ibid.*, pp. 394, 427, 428.

<sup>15</sup> Same to same (no. 18), Copenhagen, 11 Nivôse, an II. (December 31, 1793). *Ibid.*, p. 476.

<sup>16</sup> Grouvelle au Ministre des Affaires Étrangères, Copenhagen, September 3, 1793. *Ibid.*, p. 232.

<sup>17</sup> Same to same, Copenhagen, October 1, 1793. *Ibid.*, p. 270.

<sup>18</sup> Deforgues, ministre des Affaires Étrangères, à Grouvelle, Paris, November 13, 1793. *Ibid.*, p. 347.

<sup>19</sup> Grouvelle au Ministre des Affaires Étrangères, Copenhagen, December 17, 1793. *Ibid.*, p. 345.



elaborated the early approaches to Sweden and Grouvelle's diplomacy into an ambitious design to strengthen the European influence of the revolutionary government, already stiffened into some coherence by the victories of 1793. The project was to unite all remaining neutral naval states about the French revolutionary executive in resistance to British sea power. It included Sweden, Denmark, Turkey, Poland, Venice, Genoa, and the United States. Singly these nations saw themselves powerless to enforce what they considered to be principles of fairness toward neutral flags. Together they might be strong enough to revive the power of the armed neutrality of the last war. The foundation of the League, reads this interesting document, was to be "the indefeasible rights and independence of these nations and their immediate interests".

As a *foyer* for this "counter-coalition", so formidable on paper, and really pregnant with powerful possibilities, the committee selected the Scandinavian courts. The monarchies were to enter a joint defensive alliance to assert the principles of armed neutrality against all naval aggressions. France would offer peculiar commercial advantages to the armed neutrals, and on actual signature of a treaty she would engage to furnish 6,000,000 *livres*, in addition to 500,000 *livres* for each vessel of the line fully equipped and 300,000 *livres* for each frigate.

The committee had drawn up instructions accordingly and had appointed proper diplomatic agents for the affair, when there arrived in Paris a copy of a convention<sup>20</sup> already signed by Sweden and Denmark and setting forth in a timorous way the armed neutrality principles. This treaty, signed secretly on March 27, 1794, was for the duration of the war. The two northern powers agreed to furnish a joint armament of sixteen ships-of-the-line to protect their subjects in the exercise of rights sanctioned by law and indisputably to be enjoyed by independent nations. The Baltic was to be closed to the war-vessels of belligerent nations, and to be free, therefore, from rules of war. Faltering protection against illegal interference with their rightful commerce by the immense British and Russian naval forces was provided as follows: the neutral allies would make reprisals in concert after all other means of dissuasion had been rejected, and "at the latest, four months after the rejection of their behests, whenever such reprisals should be deemed suitable, the

<sup>20</sup> "Projet d'Arrêté du Comité de Salut Public", undated. It was never carried out. Adet, former minister to the United States, was nominated. It is indorsed "N'a pas eu lieu". Arch. Aff. Étrang., Dannemarck, vol. 170, p. 85. See also "Rapport au Comité de Salut Public, Suède et Dannemarck", Arch. Aff. Étrang., Suède, vol. 286, p. 225, *verso*. This document enables one to fix the date of the *Projet*.



Baltic always excepted". In no specific form were the rights of neutral nations defined; definition was to be covered by the treaty interpretations of the Baltic Powers<sup>21</sup>—the principles of the First Armed Neutrality. The lack of resolute provision for energetic action made the convention at best a weak one. "It is a demonstration of a force and temper which do not exist", wrote the observing Gouverneur Morris from France.<sup>22</sup>

Half-hearted as this instrument may have been, it was a good beginning for the plans then being formulated in Paris. The instructions already drawn up were dropped, for what they aimed to accomplish in the first place had been attained. The Swedes had been indiscreet enough to close the convention door before the French-subsidy horse had been led in—unwisely they had asked for money after the treaty had been signed and made known.<sup>23</sup> At one time the committee had decided to advance substantial funds to accelerate the Swedish armament,<sup>24</sup> but Grouvelle wrote that it seemed probable that Sweden herself might afford the initial expenses of armament,<sup>25</sup> and the money-chest of the revolutionary executive was notoriously hollow. The advances were never made. The failure of the French subsidy, the threatening presence in the Baltic and North seas of Russian and British fleets, and one other factor smothered the infant armed neutrality in its cradle. With it expired the hopes of including other powers in the "counter-coalition". The other, third, factor in the downfall of this ambitious diplomatic enterprise was the diplomatic mission to England of John Jay, chief justice of the United States.

In the spring of 1794, without the ministry in London being immediately aware of it, owing to the tardiness of winter mail, British-

<sup>21</sup> Treaty of Mutual Defense, Liberty, Security and Commerce, March 27, 1794. F. O., ser. 115, vol. 3; *Annual Register*, 1794, pp. 238-239.

<sup>22</sup> "You will observe that time is given the belligerent Powers for repentance and amendment, before any hostile act of resentment by the contracting parties. You will observe, also, that the period specified is sufficient to permit the arrestation of all supplies shipped for this country [France] during the present season. Thus the next autumn and winter are left clear for negotiation, *should the allies be unsuccessful in this campaign*." Morris to Randolph, Sainport, May 31, 1794. *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, I. 409.

<sup>23</sup> Grouvelle à Deforgues, no. 30, Copenhagen, March 28, 1794. Arch. Aff. Étrang., Dannemarck, vol. 70.

<sup>24</sup> "Rapport", etc., *supra*. Arch. Aff. Étrang., Suède, vol. 286, pp. 224-227.

<sup>25</sup> See long and interesting despatch of Grouvelle au Ministre des Affaires Étrangères, Copenhagen, February 18, 1794. Arch. Aff. Étrang., Dannemarck, vol. 170, p. 55.

American relations had reached a critical stage. The crisis had been brought about by the several familiar disputes between England and America that in March had suddenly ripened to an ominous condition. First were the old disputes about the northern frontier posts on American soil. British troops still held these strategic points under the ostensible but not real excuse<sup>26</sup> that the United States had first violated the treaty by obstructing the collection of ante-bellum debts to English merchants. With these stood the legacy of minor disputes also left by the treaty. Secondly, there was the disappointment of the American government at not being able to conclude a commercial treaty with Great Britain, whose navigation laws struck sharply at the now independent states, particularly by excluding their ships from the British West Indies. England at first had been quite content to "sit still" in the agreeable commercial *status quo*, since American trade still ran in old colonial channels to English wharves;<sup>27</sup> but this commercial situation, so undesirable to the United States, led to American tariff and tonnage duties in favor of American vessels.<sup>28</sup> This bore particularly hard on British trade, because the traffic with England constituted three-fourths of all American commerce and over half of this three-fourths was carried in British ships.<sup>29</sup> A strong movement, developing in Congress and the administration, under the leadership of Madison and Jefferson, to discriminate specifically against the British flag, had only been checked by a sudden decision to establish a permanent British legation in Philadelphia headed by George Hammond, first British

<sup>26</sup> This statement is based on a careful reading of the Canadian correspondence in Ottawa and London, which shows that orders were actually sent to General Haldimand to hold the posts before the very convenient and plausible excuse of American violations of the treaty was discovered. The evidence is too long to be quoted in detail here. Particularly illuminating, however, is the despatch of Sydney to Haldimand, April 8, 1784 (Canadian Archives, Q 23, 55), sent before the formal exchange of ratifications of the definitive treaty. It should be read in connection with Grenville's argument as stated in Jay to Randolph, London, September 13, 1794. *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, I. 485-496. See also Channing, *History of the United States*, IV. 148-149, for an illuminating note.

<sup>27</sup> Sheffield, *Observations on the Commerce of the American States* (1784, sixth ed.), p. 161; Report of the Privy Council on American Trade, January 28, 1791, in *Collection of Important Papers on Navigation and Trade* (London, 1808), p. 114.

<sup>28</sup> Acts of July 4, July 20, 1789; June 20, August 10, 1790. *U. S. Statutes at Large*, I. 27, 180, 335.

<sup>29</sup> The proportion which American commerce to Great Britain bore to the total is ascertained by a comparison of American exports and imports as stated annually from 1790 in *Am. State Pap., Commerce and Navigation*, vol. I. For figures for tonnage see: *Collection of Interesting and Important Papers on Navigation and Trade* (London, 1808), app. XXIV.

minister to the United States.<sup>30</sup> Soon it became evident that Hammond had no instructions to sign a commercial treaty and that he was trying to couple the evacuation of the frontier posts with the establishment of a "neutral" Indian barrier state that would keep the natives of the great American hinterland north of the Ohio in a British sphere of influence, economic and political. The negotiations as to the border fell into abeyance, and when frontier friction between British officers and "British" Indians, and the Americans, had worked disastrously on the self-control of Lord Dorchester, governor-general of Canada, the latter made his notorious and bellicose secret speech to a delegation of Indian tribes, February 10, 1794, in which he prophesied an immediate war with the Americans and sought the alliance of the tomahawk.<sup>31</sup> Intelligence of this unwary utterance soon leaked out. It reached Philadelphia almost simultaneously with the arrival of news from the West Indies of the capture of about three hundred American schooners under the wholly arbitrary Order in Council of November 6, 1793, and the barbarous incarceration of their crews and officers.

In late March and April the majority of the American people were for war with Great Britain. The crystallizing "Democratic" party, under the leadership of Madison and the now retired Jefferson, passed an embargo for a month, soon extended for another thirty days, on all shipping in American harbors. Bills for actual sequestration of British property and vigorous discrimination against the British flag specifically, immediately received strong support in Congress. The movement was headed off by Alexander Hamilton, profound leader of the Federalist party, that had formed in contradistinction to the "Democrats" (the division in 1794 was chiefly over the British policy). In a war with England at that particular time, the Federalists forecasted the total collapse of the new government under the Constitution. The new political system, brought into practical operation by Hamilton's genius in establishing American credit, depended for revenues almost wholly on the tariff and tonnage duties collected in American ports. Almost alone this financial means upheld the credit of the federal and the assumed state debts and paid the operating expenses of the government itself.

<sup>30</sup> See Beckwith to Grenville, March 3, 1791, R. O., F. O., ser. 4, vol. 12; P. Colquhoun to Grenville, August 5, 1791, *Dropmore Papers*, II. 157; Beckwith to Grenville, Philadelphia, July 31, 1791, R. O., F. O., ser. 4, vol. 12; Colquhoun to Grenville, July 29, 1791, *Dropmore Papers*, II. 145; *Can. Arch. Report*, 1890, p. 172.

<sup>31</sup> For copy of speech see *Annual Register*, 1794, pp. 250-251; also *Can. Arch.*, Q 64, 109.

By war, suddenly to eliminate three-fourths of American commerce and to endanger the rest to the point of extinction meant to knock away the scaffolding of credit from beneath the new government, and so to precipitate its destruction. A lapse into the pitiful political helplessness of the Confederation would be then inevitable. To avoid this, Hamilton, in close and quiet intimacy with Hammond, used that connection, in a sort of "back-stairs" diplomacy,<sup>32</sup> to thwart the official anti-Anglican character of the negotiations of the Secretary of State, Jefferson. With a group of Federalist senators<sup>33</sup> he now had sufficient influence in the administration to bring about the appointment of Chief Justice John Jay for the peace mission of 1794. In Congress he marshalled sufficient power to block the retaliatory and hostile measures until the results of Jay's mission should be known. Meanwhile the Federalists with vigor supported a bill for raising an army, and Hamilton led the British minister to believe that if Jay did not succeed in getting a certain minimum of moderate concessions, which he outlined in private to him, the existing peaceful relations with England could not endure.<sup>34</sup>

At the very moment when the Danish-Swedish convention of March 27, 1794, was signed, this ominous American war-cloud was rising on the other side of the Atlantic. Meanwhile the solidity of the First Coalition was beginning to weaken. Secret agents of the British Foreign Office were reporting that France was seeking to detach Spain by approaches through neutral Denmark.<sup>35</sup> As a matter of fact, the Spanish minister in Copenhagen did have instructions to make overtures looking toward peace.<sup>36</sup> Simultaneously, in view of the greater allurements of the Polish spoil, Prussia's influence on the Rhine was weakening. Among the allies "there was far more of disunion than union".<sup>37</sup>

Though the Swedish-Danish convention had been ratified in secret, and its negotiation was supposed to have been kept in the same secrecy, the whole train of Franco-Scandinavian diplomacy was well and with a fair degree of accuracy known to Lord Grenville. The increasing naval armaments of Denmark had for some time excited the suspicion of his representative in Copenhagen,

<sup>32</sup> See evidence cited above, note 7.

<sup>33</sup> King, *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, I, 516.

<sup>34</sup> Hammond to Grenville (no. 15), Philadelphia, April 17, 1794. F. O., ser. 5, vol. 4.

<sup>35</sup> *Précis of Secret Intelligence from Copenhagen*. F. O., Holland, ser. 37, vol. 36.

<sup>36</sup> Grouvelle Correspondence, Arch. Aff. Étrang., Dannemarck, vols. 169 and 170.

<sup>37</sup> J. H. Rose, *William Pitt and the Great War*, p. 204.

though Count von Bernstorff had strongly denied any connection with France,<sup>38</sup> and at Stockholm express assurances were made that no arrangements with Denmark were contemplated.<sup>39</sup> Grouvelle, who was more privy to the chancellor than any other foreigner, was imprudent enough to send his despatches to Paris by ordinary mail, with only parts of them in cipher—a lack of caution wholly inexcusable, for which he was later roundly censured by the Committee of Public Safety.<sup>40</sup> It was so reckless a procedure as almost to prick the investigator's suspicions as to Grouvelle himself. Spies read nearly all of his correspondence. A concise précis of it is preserved at the British Record Office<sup>41</sup> and tallies perfectly with the original despatches in the library of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs at Paris. They knew the content of Grouvelle's despatches at Downing Street almost as soon as at the Quai d'Orsay.

The Swedish minister in London was Laurent von Engeström. He informed Thomas Pinckney, American representative there, on April 28, 1794, that he had instructions not only to communicate a copy of the convention but to invite the accession of the United States to it. Pinckney seemed greatly pleased. He secured a statement to that effect in writing and sent it home the very day. It would be received "with open arms", Engeström understood him to believe.<sup>42</sup> The same day, the Swedish and Danish ministers, "lest their sincerity be suspected",<sup>43</sup> gave a copy of the convention to Lord Grenville. Though nothing was divulged of the overture to Pinckney, Grenville, through the intercepted Grouvelle despatches, soon learned of it by the same means by which he had already known of the convention itself. Immediately he instructed Hammond, at Philadelphia, to make the utmost exertions to prevent the success of any such proposal. To the American "ministers" he must confi-

<sup>38</sup> D. Hailes (British chargé d'affaires at Copenhagen) to Grenville, Copenhagen, March 24, 1794, cipher, rec'd April 3, 1794. F. O., Denmark, ser. 22, vol. 18.

<sup>39</sup> H. G. Spencer (British minister to Sweden) to Grenville, Stockholm, April 18, 1794, cipher, F. O., Sweden, ser. 73, vol. 17; same to same, Stockholm, April 18, 1794, cipher, *ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> Commissionnaire des Affaires Étrangères (Buchot) à Grouvelle, Paris, 4 Prairial, an II. Arch. Aff. Étrang., Dannemarck, vol. 170, p. 16.

<sup>41</sup> Précis of Secret Intelligence from Copenhagen. F. O., Holland, ser. 37, vol. 56.

<sup>42</sup> Engeström to the Royal Chancellor (Frederick Sparre), London, April 29, 1794. Swedish Royal Archives, Anglica, Engeström's Despatches. For transcriptions of such Swedish documents as are cited here, I am indebted to Dr. Lydia Wahlström, of Stockholm.

<sup>43</sup> Engeström to Erenheim (Swedish minister, Copenhagen), May 26, 1794. *Ibid.*

dently emphasize the marked difference in circumstances between the position of the United States and the Baltic Powers, laying stress on the point that in return for fair neutrality on the part of the United States, American commerce had been treated in a spirit of fairness (this was written before Grenville had heard of the exploding American wrath against the British naval policy). The American government, wrote Grenville, must be aware of the risks of being drawn into a conflict with England, especially in view of the weak state of the Scandinavian navy.<sup>44</sup> Three weeks later, on June 5, Grenville informed Hammond that he had reason to believe that the Swedish proposal to America had not the sanction of the Danish court, but he urged the closest attention to the matter. It was true that the Engeström note to Pinckney did not have the support of Denmark. Grenville learned this through Grouvelle's despatches. Shortly after it had been made, Engeström received instructions that Denmark had not acquiesced in the *démarche*, and that any American answer must be considered merely *ad referendum*.<sup>45</sup> Bernstorff's reason for declining to join the invitation—this was still before the news of the British-American crisis was known in Europe—was that he considered the American navy wholly too feeble to co-operate effectively;<sup>46</sup> really the reason was that too much of this adventurous policy on his part would probably result in a quick offensive by the English or Russian fleet, then parading the Baltic<sup>47</sup>—the lot of Holland in 1780 and the fate of Denmark in 1800.

One of the most interesting aspects of British-American diplomacy in this period lies in the relations of time and distance and the precarious schedule of packet-boats. In the days when neither cable nor wireless telegraph existed, the international situation of the world did not vary like a stockbroker's ribbon as the telegraph clicks off each detail of news from the governments of Christendom and other governments; the most important transatlantic intelligence was often long delayed, and often when news finally arrived it came in big consignments instead of in daily dribbles. Such was the case in the crisis of 1794. Up till June 10, after the American commissioner, Jay, had actually set foot on English soil, Grenville had not

<sup>44</sup> Grenville to Hammond, Downing Street, May 14, 1794 (no. 12), cipher. F. O., ser. 5, vol. 5.

<sup>45</sup> The Royal Chancellor (Sparre) to Engeström, Stockholm, May 16, 1794. Swedish Royal Archives, Anglica (1794).

<sup>46</sup> Grouvelle to Buchot (minister of foreign affairs), no. 41, 9 Prairial, an II. (May 29, 1794). Arch. Aff. Étrang., Dannemarck, vols. 170. 180.

<sup>47</sup> Erenheim to Engeström, Copenhagen, July 8, 1794. Swedish Royal Archives, Anglica (1794).

received an official word about the critical American situation.<sup>48</sup> On that day, June 10, a great deal of surprising news from North America lay on the desks of the foreign and home secretaries when the despatches from the Canadian and American mail-packets were opened. American indignation over the captures made under the additional and unprecedented Order in Council of November 6, 1793,<sup>49</sup> Dorchester's speech of February 10 to the Indians, the news of imminent hostilities on the frontier,<sup>50</sup> the embargo, the sequestration and non-intercourse bills, the resolution to send Jay, the sober interview between Hamilton and Hammond, the real and actual imminence of war with America—with America, the source of British naval supplies and the largest single customer for British manufactures—made up a budget of information that gave the Secretary for Foreign Affairs considerable pause and food for thought as on the same morning he unsealed a letter from Falmouth bearing the signature of John Jay, and announcing his commission from the President as special envoy to His Majesty.

The news was a complete surprise; up to this time Grenville had dealt with the United States in a leisurely fashion; there had been little uneasiness at Downing Street over the American situation. Now it was apparent, suddenly, that this confidence was wholly misplaced.

In addition to the information received by way of the intercepted French despatches, Grenville was receiving other secret reports, false indeed, which made the Scandinavian-American possibilities seem more alarming. On June 20, the day of the first conference between Jay and Grenville, came a letter from the British charge at Berlin, telling of an interview with Count Finckenstein, the famous Prussian minister of foreign affairs, in which the dubious disposition of America had been discussed. Finckenstein confided some American information that, in view of Jefferson's resignation as secretary of state and retirement on January 1, 1794, to Monticello, was as weirdly fantastic as it must have been startling to Grenville. Jefferson, said the Prussian count, was expected soon in Denmark, there to concert measures that should be followed by the neutral nations.<sup>51</sup> Strangely enough, the Danish chancellor also had

<sup>48</sup> Hammond to Grenville, February 20, April 17, May 1, 1794, F. O., ser. 5, vol. 4; Grenville to Hammond, June 5, 1794, cipher, F. O., ser. 115, vol. 3.

<sup>49</sup> To "stop and detain all ships laden with goods the produce of any colony belonging to France, or carrying provisions or other supplies for the use of any such colony, and should bring the same, with their cargoes, for legal adjudication in our courts of admiralty". *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, I. 430.

<sup>50</sup> Dorchester to Dundas, February 24, 1794. *Can. Arch.*, Q 67, 88.

<sup>51</sup> G. H. Rose to Grenville, Berlin, June 10, 1794, rec'd June 20. F. O., Prussia, ser. 64, vol. 29.



a similar notion.<sup>52</sup> A few days later came a letter from Hammond, of May 25, telling of the increasing hostility of the American public due to the news of the occupation of the old Miami fort<sup>53</sup> by British troops, and enclosing the acrid correspondence between himself and Randolph, Jefferson's Francophil successor.

As if this were not enough, there arrived, at very near this time, one of the curious Francis Drake bulletins, which purported to transmit secret copies of the minutes of the meetings of the Committee of Public Safety, but were really literary productions meant to be perused by and designed to mislead the British Foreign Office.<sup>54</sup> Whether Grenville was wholly duped by these inventions is uncertain, but he expressly asked Drake to get him information about French negotiations with Sweden and Denmark. The "secret" information which Drake furnished professed to relate that in the Committee of Public Safety despatches had been read from its American agents, under date of April 1, which declared war between the United States and Great Britain inevitable, and stated that immediately afterward a treaty would be concluded between the former and Denmark and Sweden. The French commissioners in America were represented as having requested power to conclude preliminaries of a treaty with the United States and to guarantee Congress that the Convention would not treat with the Northern Powers without admitting

<sup>52</sup> Grouvelle au Ministre des Affaires Étrangères, Copenhagen, 22 Prairial, an II. (June 11, 1794). Arch. Aff. Étrang., Dannemarck, vol. 170, p. 192. The present writer has not been able wholly to run down the source of this rumor.

<sup>53</sup> Near the city of Toledo, Ohio.

<sup>54</sup> The validity of the Drake despatches was first discredited by Mr. J. H. Clapham (*English Historical Review*, January, 1897) and by Professor A. Aulard (*Révolution Française*, 1897, vol. XXXII.) on the ground that they do not agree with certain well-established facts in the sources for the history of the Committee of Public Safety. This opinion rested unchallenged until 1914, when M. Albert Mathiez presented an article in defense of the documents, citing sources with which to him they appear to agree ("Histoire Secrète du Comité de Salut Public", *Revue des Questions Historiques*, January, 1914). Without being wholly familiar with the sources for the Committee of Public Safety, the writer was soon convinced, by collating the despatches from Grouvelle from Copenhagen (whence the committee got its information), those from the French commissioners in Philadelphia to the Committee of Public Safety, and the despatches of Gouverneur Morris, American minister to France, that the Drake information was not true. Very cleverly, just enough truth is put into the despatches to make them deceiving. For documents see: Turner, "Correspondence of the French Ministers", Am. Hist. Assoc., *Ann. Rept.*, 1903, vol. II.; Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis, vols. 40-43, 1793, 1794; and Dannemarck, vols. 169, 170, 1793, 1794; *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, vol. I., and published works of G. Morris, edited by A. C. Morris (1889) and J. Sparks (1832).



the United States to any treaty made by them.<sup>55</sup> This last request was said to have been rejected, but the executive was authorized to negotiate with Morris, the American minister, and to report. It was also stated that letters from Stockholm of May 11 represented that court as ready to ratify a treaty with the French republic.<sup>56</sup>

In short, the British ministry in the summer of 1794 stood confronted with all the dangers of the revival of the old Armed Neutrality at a time when—despite the Prussian treaty of April, 1794—the coalition against France was already weakening<sup>57</sup> toward the final disintegration of 1795. One exception there was to the situation of 1781: Pitt could count on Catherine the Great to join Britain against the Baltic Powers,<sup>58</sup> and Prussia, now a nominal ally of Great Britain<sup>59</sup> and absorbed in the Polish partition, had no inclination again to become a member of the Baltic combination. But there can be no doubt that the Baltic situation as viewed by the British ministry in June and July, 1794, had an appreciable effect on the American negotiations: it would be folly to allow the United States, the greatest foreign customer of Great Britain,<sup>60</sup> at a time when commerce and the entrepôt system were providing the revenue for the French war,<sup>61</sup> to join in a war against England, or in any such system as the policy of the Northern Powers, greased by French diplomacy, seemed to invite. It would serve to divide the energies and diminish the supplies of the British navy, and to weaken the financial sinews of the government in its great struggle with France. Great Britain desired war no more than did the American Federalists. The time had come for some kind of immediate settlement with the United States.

Grenville took immediate steps to relieve the American tension. Concessions were made which postponed all immediate danger from America and looked toward a conciliatory negotiation. The old policy of procrastinating at the frontier posts until a "neutral" Indian barrier state had been created was abandoned and arrangements made to step across the line to Canadian soil, in the event of a treaty.

<sup>55</sup> Bulletin no. 25, Despatches of Francis Drake. *Dropmore Papers*, II, 578. The writer has been unable to find any despatch of April 1 in the French archives, or anything resembling it.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> Rose, *William Pitt and the Great War*, ch. VIII.

<sup>58</sup> Prussia's treaty of alliance with Great Britain of 1793 provided for measures to induce neutral powers to adopt a harassing attitude toward French commerce.

<sup>59</sup> Whitworth to Grenville, St. Petersburg, April 15, 22, 23, 1794. F. O., Russia, ser. 65, vol. 27.

<sup>60</sup> See Chatham Papers, bdl. 286, R. O., cited above.

<sup>61</sup> Mahan, *Sea Power and French Revolution*, II, 18.

For his hostile speech to the Indians, a sharp reprimand to Dorchester followed, accompanied by concise instructions to use every means to cultivate a friendly disposition on the part of the United States.<sup>62</sup> In case hostilities had already broken out between frontier units of American and British forces, Grenville and Jay agreed that everything should remain *in statu quo* pending the negotiations.<sup>63</sup> The king issued an Order in Council admitting all the American captures made in the West Indies to appeal in English prize courts from the petty and arbitrary admiralty courts of the islands.<sup>64</sup> By this all that Hamilton had stipulated to Hammond, on the eve of Jay's departure, as "absolutely indispensable for an amicable settlement of differences",<sup>65</sup> was granted, and the door opened to a settlement of all points in dispute between the two nations. Grenville even went a step further. The Order in Council of June 8, 1793 (that of November 6 had been altered already in January to the sense of June 8), was unostentatiously repealed in so far as it directed the capture and pre-emption of neutral grain-ships bound for France.<sup>66</sup>

From August till November the negotiations between Jay and Grenville went on in leisurely discussion. The main principles necessary for a treaty had been agreed on when the British concessions were made and when Jay had consented to a commission for the adjudication of debts due to British creditors, and for settling the question of French prizes sold in American waters after Washington's prohibition of their sale. Grenville's bargaining after this was very sharp. He attenuated his chaffering until he could hear from Hammond precisely the position of the American administration as to the Baltic Powers.

In Jay's official instructions, made familiar by the publication for the Senate of part of the Jay negotiations, was the following paragraph:

You will have no difficulty in gaining access to the ministers of Russia, Denmark, and Sweden, at the Court of London. The principles of the armed neutrality would abundantly cover our neutral rights. If, therefore, the situation of things with respect to Great Britain should

<sup>62</sup> This led eventually to Dorchester's resignation. Dorchester to Dundas, Quebec, September 4, 1794. Can. Arch., Q 69-1, p. 176.

<sup>63</sup> Jay to Randolph, London, July 12, 1794, *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, I. 479; Grenville to Hammond, July 15, 1794, F. O., ser. 115, vol. 3.

<sup>64</sup> Orders in Council, West Indies and America (1786-1797). R. O.

<sup>65</sup> Hammond to Grenville (no. 15), Philadelphia, April 17, 1794. F. O., 5, 4.

<sup>66</sup> Instructions to Naval Commanders, approved by the Privy Council, August 6, 1794, R. O., Colonial Office 5: 33; Orders in Council, West Indies to America, 1786-1797, Privy Council Register, vol. 141, p. 11.

dictate the necessity of taking the precaution of foreign co-operation upon this head; if no prospect of accommodation should be thwarted by the danger of such a measure being known to the British court; and if an entire view of all our political relations shall, in your judgment, permit the step, you will sound those ministers upon the probability of an alliance with their nations to support those principles.<sup>67</sup>

Randolph wrote this paragraph. But Jay assumed a slightly patronizing tone toward an official superior who was really of inferior political stature,<sup>68</sup> and paid attention to the formal instructions of the Secretary of State only when convenient. That Jay might of necessity waive the principle of the armed neutrality, even to the extent of acquiescing in the Order of June 8, was admitted in Hamilton's private letter to him.<sup>69</sup> Hamilton later states his disapproval of any diplomatic union with the Baltic Powers.

At first Jay was intimate with the Danish and Swedish ministers at London. But it soon became their policy to "let him take his way" without making any definite assurances.<sup>70</sup> Denmark was threatened by the Russian fleet patrolling the Baltic. Sweden had to guard its Finnish and Pomeranian frontiers. There was also the English fleet which five years later worked such havoc at Copenhagen. The Armed Neutrality of 1794 was a threat rather than an immediate direct force. Only if political circumstances were opportune did it allow actual reprisals and the closure of the Baltic. Engeström's correspondence with Stockholm shows that while Swedish diplomats considered more initiative advisable as to the United States, the Danish chancellor hesitated. He thought that, if no agreement were reached by Jay with the British court, the Americans would fall naturally into the arms of the Scandinavians and an enlarged armed neutrality, and then would come the best time for real negotiations with them. If a treaty were concluded and concessions were made to the United States not allowed to other neutrals, it would be almost equivalent to a declaration of war by England on Denmark and Sweden.<sup>71</sup> Whatever may have been the conferences with the Scandinavians, of which not a word was ever made known in the official correspondence turned over to the Amer-

<sup>67</sup> Instructions to Jay, May 6, 1794. *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, I. 473. This was before any news of the Engeström overture to Pinckney could have reached America, and was a mere conjecture of a possible diplomatic lever. Randolph's ignorance of the real state of European politics is shown by his allusion to Russia, then the maritime ally of England.

<sup>68</sup> Jay to Randolph, July 30, 1794. *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, I. 480.

<sup>69</sup> Hamilton to Jay, May 6, 1794. *Hamilton, Works*, IV. 551.

<sup>70</sup> Engeström to the Royal Chancellor (Sparre), August 12, 1794. Swedish Royal Archives, Anglica (1794).

<sup>71</sup> Erenheim to Engeström, Copenhagen, July 8, 1794. *Ibid.*

ican Senate, Jay by August had turned aside from such cordiality.<sup>72</sup> This was after the first conciliatory concessions had been made to him by the British negotiator. One wonders whether the Federalists could have later put the Jay Treaty through the Senate if *all* the correspondence had been published!

Before Grenville learned from Hammond the real attitude of the American government toward armed neutrality, he was on the point of making much greater concessions in the proposed American treaty than were eventually considered. On September 30, 1794, Jay submitted a draft which, he believed, incorporated most of the principles on which previous conferences had led him to expect agreement. No copy of this draft was conveyed to the Senate with the other drafts and projects of the negotiations turned over to it at the time when the treaty came up for ratification. One can guess the reason. This draft—more important than all the preliminary projects—was not included in the Jay correspondence, and probably was never even read by anyone on this side of the Atlantic,<sup>73</sup> because it compared too unfavorably with the terms of the final treaty itself. A copy, however, is in the British Record Office.<sup>74</sup>

There is no space here to enumerate the favorable terms of the draft of September 30. They were never agreed to because, ten days previously, Grenville had heard from Hammond that Alexander Hamilton said the United States would never accede to the Scandinavian convention. Hammond reported that Hamilton said

with great seriousness and with every demonstration of sincerity . . . that it was the settled policy of this government in every contingency, even in that of an open contest with Great Britain, to avoid entangling itself with European connections, which would only tend to involve this country where it might have no possible interest, and connect it to a common cause with allies, from whom, in the moment of danger, it could derive no succor. . . . In support of this policy Mr. Hamilton urged many of the arguments advanced in your lordship's despatch, the dissimilitude between the political views as well as between general interests of the United States and those of the Baltic Powers, and the inefficiency of the latter, from their enfeebled condition, either to protect the navigation of the former in Europe or to afford it any active assistance if necessary in its own territory.

Hammond could not find out whether the supposed Swedish propositions had arrived from Pinckney, but from Hamilton's decided man-

<sup>72</sup> Engeström to the Royal Chancellor (Sparre), August 12, 1794. Swedish Royal Archives, Anglica (1794).

<sup>73</sup> It is not included among the duplicates of Jay's correspondence in the Jay manuscripts in the New York Historical Society's collections, nor, of course, in the published *Works* of Jay.

<sup>74</sup> F. O., misc. ser. 95, vol. 512.

ner he believed that the matter had received his attention before, and that what he had stated represented the deliberations of himself and of the American administration.<sup>75</sup> That the Swedish proposal was received with no enthusiasm is indicated by Hamilton's letter of July 8, to Randolph, quoted in his works.<sup>76</sup>

The result of this information in the hands of Grenville was to reduce all his fear of American co-operation with the Baltic Powers. With the latest news from Philadelphia in mind, no reason any longer existed why Grenville should submit to Jay's propositions of maritime law, and, so that the Americans were mollified sufficiently to prevent hostilities or injurious commercial legislation, there was no longer any particular occasion for hurry. Jay, on the other hand, feared that some unforeseen contingency in the maelstrom of European policy might derange the attitude of the British ministry toward the United States. The only concession Grenville would now make was to agree to a joint survey and settlement by commission of the unknown northwestern boundary. The other new points of Jay's draft he deemed "insurmountable obstacles".

Convinced that he could get no better terms and that on the whole those he had were satisfactory, the American envoy signed the treaty which has since been connected with his name. The articles, long familiar in American history, were a triumph of British diplomacy. The only concessions made were the evacuation of the posts, which Grenville had before decided on in order to prevent a disruption of the valuable British-American trade;<sup>77</sup> the admission of American vessels, during the war only, to a direct West Indian trade, which the conditions of war had rendered it impracticable for British ships adequately to maintain;<sup>78</sup> and compensation for captures "made under cover" of the arbitrary Orders in Council, without

<sup>75</sup> Hammond to Grenville, no. 28, New York, August 3, 1794, rec'd September 20. F. O., ser. 5, vol. 5. That the matter had received discussion, probably in the Cabinet, is indicated by Hamilton's letter of July 8, 1794 (at about the time the Engeström proposal would have been received in America): "The United States have peculiar advantages from situation, which would thereby be thrown into common stock without an equivalent. The United States had better stand in its own ground."

<sup>76</sup> "If a war, on the question of Neutral Rights, should take place, common interest would secure all the co-operation which is practical and occasional arrangements may be made; what has already been done in this respect appears to be sufficient." Hamilton to Randolph, Philadelphia, July 8, 1794. Hamilton, *Works*, IV. 571.

<sup>77</sup> Consideration on suggestions proposed for the Government of Upper and Lower Canada. R. O., C. O., ser. 42, vol. 88, pp. 575-579.

<sup>78</sup> Mahan, *Sea Power and French Revolution*, II. 258. This article was not ratified by the Senate.

giving up the principle of those orders. The price paid by the Federalists was, to make, by abeyance, a heavy though a regrettably necessary sacrifice of principle in the face of other national interests. Only one real advantage was secured—the evacuation of the frontier posts and the clearance of the last vestige of British control from the soil of the United States. By means of a mixed commission to compensate for spoliation “under cover” of the Orders in Council, Pitt secured from America a peaceable acquiescence in British naval policy that reversed completely the position taken by the young republic in all its previous treaties.<sup>79</sup>

The episode of the abortive renewal in 1794 of the Armed Neutrality and the relations of the United States to it are interesting in two ways. The decision of Hamilton, who in 1794 preponderated in the councils of Washington, not to participate in a European combination, marks the first definite acceptance by the government of the United States of the principle of abstention from foreign entanglements. Though the idea of such a policy may not have been wholly original with Hamilton, it was he who first gave it practical application. It was the proposal of the Scandinavians in the world war of the French Revolution that offered a chance for such a decision, and on the basis of Hamilton's reasoning the new government's policy was first actually oriented in that direction.<sup>80</sup> Two years later it was publicly restated in Washington's Farewell Address, as an American policy of abstention from foreign entanglements; Hamilton's verbal coinage of 1794 was there repeated. In

<sup>79</sup> If the principle of the rule of 1756 was not recognized, it was consented to tacitly—a voluntary relaxation from it having been made, so far as the trade between the United States and the French islands was concerned, by the repeal of the Order of November 6, 1793. Restrictions on American exportations of stipulated West Indian products, of which the voyage had been broken by landing on American soil, would have cut off the carriage of French colonial products, had the article been ratified by the Senate. There was no agreement on the question of food-stuffs as contraband, which the United States was bound by treaties with France, Sweden, and Holland to treat as non-contraband; the practice of Great Britain, who controlled the sea, in pre-empting food-stuffs bound for France was allowed by not being prohibited. In fact, Grenville stated that the treaty was a specific recognition of the British principle in this respect, when a little later the American government questioned additional instructions to British naval commanders of April 23, 1795, to detain all ships laden with provision for France. (Grenville to Bond—chargé d'affaires at Philadelphia after Hammond's departure—November 4, 1795, enclosing copy of the instructions, F. O., 115, 4). The principles of free ships, free goods, and the immunity of naval stores from seizure as contraband were wholly lost sight of.

<sup>80</sup> The idea, itself, that abstention from European alliances was advisable had occurred to other American political thinkers before Hamilton first put it into operation. See Hart, *Monroe Doctrine*, pp. 9-10.

this sense, Alexander Hamilton was the author of one-half of the Monroe Doctrine, just as nearly thirty years later John Quincy Adams was the author of the other half.

Again, the episode has its interest from the ambitious Franco-Scandinavian "neutral counter-coalition", so adventurously constructed in the imagination of French diplomatists. Though the lack of French subsidies to Sweden prevented that power from arming more actively in concert with Denmark against the preponderating naval power of England and Russia, the Jay Treaty administered the final blow to this daring diplomatic conception. Bernstorff constantly insisted to Grouvelle,<sup>81</sup> while the Jay negotiations were proceeding, that it was the intention of the northern allies jointly to invite the accession of the United States. But that was not done, and meanwhile the treaty was signed. "The agreement by which the American agent, Jay, has just terminated the disputes between England and America", wrote Grouvelle from Copenhagen to the Committee of Public Safety after the treaty became known there, "breaks absolutely this *liaison*" (*i. e.*, a possible Scandinavian-American *liaison*).<sup>82</sup> The French design for another armed neutrality quickly expired as the United States, under the guiding reason of Hamilton, acquiesced in the *real* facts of British sea power.

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS.

<sup>81</sup> Grouvelle au Ministre (des Affaires Étrangères), no. 50, Copenhagen, 27 Messidor, an II. Arch. Aff. Étrang., Dannemarck, vol. 170, p. 232.

<sup>82</sup> Grouvelle aux Membres du Comité de Salut Public, Déchiffrement, Copenhagen, 3 Nivôse, an III. *Ibid.*, p. 359.



## THE KAISER'S SECRET NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE TSAR, 1904-1905

SHORTLY before sunset on Sunday evening, July 23, 1905, the Kaiser's yacht *Hohenzollern* was steaming eastward across the Bay of Viborg toward Björkö Sound. The Russian pilot who had been waiting off Hochland since dawn was picked up, and a little later the large yacht swung up into "a pleasant, quiet place" off Björkö, and dropped anchor alongside another imperial yacht, the Tsar's *Polar Star*. The meeting had been arranged only four days before and had been kept strictly secret by both emperors. The Kaiser, who so loves dramatic scenes, had telegraphed ahead to the Tsar,

Nobody has the slightest idea of meeting. The faces of my guests will be worth seeing when they suddenly behold your yacht. A fine lark. Tableaux. Which dress for the meeting? WILLY.

The next day the Kaiser persuaded the Tsar to sign the Björkö Treaty, which, if it had become effective, would have had momentous consequences.

The public knew nothing for a dozen years of this treaty and the true purpose of the Björkö meeting. But during the past year new documents have come to light which make it possible to estimate its significance both in diplomatic history and in the light which it throws on the Kaiser's character and the methods of the Wilhelmstrasse.

The Great War has brought strange changes, and nowhere stranger than those which have taken place in Russia. Under the régime of Nicholas II. one of the revolutionaries most persecuted by the secret police was Vladimir Bourtsev. He managed to flee abroad. After the revolution of March, 1917, he returned to Petrograd and being put in charge of the private papers of the Tsar at Tsarskoe-Selo, brought to light a remarkable set of telegrams, exchanged between Nicholas II. and William II. during the period from June 16, 1904, to August 2, 1907. They were acquired by Herman Bernstein of New York, who published them in the *New York Herald* in September, 1917.<sup>1</sup> These "secret and intimate telegrams", curiously

<sup>1</sup> Reissued in book-form in January, 1918, by A. A. Knopf, *The Willy-Nicky Correspondence* (ed. Herman Bernstein). This edition, to which references below are made under the abbreviation *WNC.*, leaves much to be desired both as regards the editor's comments and as regards the dating of the telegrams: many are wrongly dated, many confuse Old Style and New Style, and many are left undated; the result is that many are not in their proper order.



enough, were exchanged in the English language, that being the language with which the Tsar had least difficulty and in which the Kaiser is also at ease.<sup>2</sup> They were despatched in cipher and were supplementary to a correspondence carried on by letters which were borne back and forth by special messengers. Whether there are other telegrams earlier or later than those published does not appear, though it is clear that early in the reign of Nicholas II. the Kaiser had begun the habit of communicating with him through personal and confidential letters.<sup>3</sup> The imperial autocrats signed their messages "Willy" and "Nicky". Occasionally, however, when the Kaiser was angry or disappointed, he took a high, stern tone, and "Willy" became "Wilhelm" or "William".

In most of the telegrams Nicholas appears as little better than a weak puppet in the hands of his dominating brother-ruler. He usually acquiesces in everything that William suggests and even re-echoes, in parrot-like fashion, William's trivial comments on the weather, the hunting, and love messages to the Tsar's German wife. By insinuations about English hostility and French unreliability, the Kaiser played upon the Tsar's fears and suspicions in order to sharpen his antagonism to England, sow distrust in his mind against France, and draw him into a binding alliance with Germany. The more one studies these telegrams the more one realizes how completely "Nicky" was as clay in "Willy's" hands.

The Willy-Nicky revelations were so extraordinary that even the Berlin *Vorwärts* declared it "incredible that the Kaiser could have adopted this style which is appropriate to a commercial traveller, but not to a diplomatic document".<sup>4</sup> It advised the *New York Herald* "when it swindles to swindle more cleverly". Outside Germany the *Amsterdammer Handelsblad* banished the revelations to the realm of fiction, declaring their untruth to be "obvious"; for "even if the Kaiser thought of doing something against England—which, however, is unthinkable, after his refusal to adopt an unfriendly attitude towards England during the Boer War—he would never have con-

<sup>2</sup> By those acquainted with Nicholas II. it is said that he knew English better than Russian. The Kaiser's English is forceful but contains many Teutonisms and an occasional obscurity in meaning.

<sup>3</sup> Tsar to Hohenlohe, September 11, 1895: "Dites à l'Empereur [William II.] qu'il continue à m'écrire personnellement, quand il aura quelque chose à me communiquer". Hohenlohe, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, II. 521.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Kaiser to Tsar, October 8, 1904 (*WNC.*, p. 59): "I think it would be practical for you to begin ordering line of battleships with [German] private firms, as the Japanese have done in England." And again, October 27, (*WNC.*, p. 71): "Our private firms would be most glad to receive contracts." See also below for the negotiations about deliveries of coal.

cluded an alliance with a beaten and destroyed Russia". And Mr. Bernstein seems to have felt it necessary to guarantee their genuineness in a telegram which the publishers print on the paper cover of the volume containing the Willy-Nicky telegrams. All doubt as to their authenticity, however, was soon set at rest by the German government itself. Through the medium of a series of five articles in the semi-official *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of September 10-14, 1917, it published a German translation of a carefully made selection of five out of a total of sixty-five Willy-Nicky telegrams. It added a valuable telegram—or at least a part of it—which the Kaiser sent to Prince von Bülow the day after the meeting at Björkö, and the notes concerning a coaling agreement made between Russia and Germany in December, 1904. Certain slight alterations were made in the documents, and they were accompanied by a commentary giving the German interpretation of the whole matter, one of the main points of which was to make it appear that no treaty at all was signed at Björkö. This perhaps seemed to the German government in September, 1917, a safe thing to do, as the Willy-Nicky correspondence does not contain the text of any signed treaty, though it contains many unmistakable references to one. But the text of this interesting document was published by the Bolsheviki in the Russian *Izvestiia* on December 29, 1917.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> The Willy-Nicky correspondence has now been further supplemented by statements from several diplomats of the time. M. Izvolsky, who was Russian minister at Copenhagen in 1905 and Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1907, happening to be in Paris in September, 1917, gave an interview to a Danish journalist which was published in the Paris *Temps* and the Copenhagen *Berlingske Tidende*, September 15, 1917; in it he gave the substance of what the Kaiser said to him a few days after the Björkö interview. More interesting are the personal character-sketches of Count Lamsdorf, M. Witte, and other persons around the Tsar given by M. A. Nekludov, at that time counsellor of the Russian embassy in Paris, "Souvenirs Diplomatiques: Autour de l'Entrevue de Bjoerkoe", in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, XLIV. 127-144 (March 1, 1918). Most valuable is the narrative of M. Bompard, French ambassador at Petrograd from 1902 to 1908, "Le Traité de Bjoerkoe", in *Revue de Paris*, XXV. 423-448 (May 15, 1918). Among other works which throw light upon the Kaiser and the Tsar or upon the general situation in 1904-1905 are: *The New Europe* for 1917; D. J. Hill, "Impressions of the Kaiser", *Harper's Magazine* (June-August, 1918); S. C. Hammer, *William the Second* (New York, 1917); E. J. Dillon, *The Eclipse of Russia*, (New York, 1918); J. Penzler and B. Krieger, *Die Reden Kaiser Wilhelms II.*, III., IV. (Reclam ed., Leipzig); Prince von Bülow, *Imperial Germany* (new revised ed., 1916); Ernst zu Reventlow, *Deutschlands Auswärtige Politik, 1888-1914* (second ed., Berlin, 1915); E. Laloy, *La Diplomatie de Guillaume II.* (Paris, 1917); A. Tardieu, *La Conférence d'Algésiras* (second ed., Paris, 1908); *id.*, *France and the Alliances* (New York, 1908); *id.*, *Le Prince de Bülow* (Paris, 1909); A. Mévil, *De la Paix de Francfort à la Conférence d'Algésiras* (Paris, 1909); A. Debidour, *Histoire Diplomatique de l'Europe, 1878-1916* (Paris, 1916-

In March, 1890, when William II. forced the resignation of Bismarck, Germany held the leading diplomatic position in Europe. Dominating the firmly established Triple Alliance, and secured on the East by the very secret "reinsurance treaties" with Russia, Germany could look unconcernedly beyond the Rhine at weakened and isolated France, or across the Channel at England, with whom she yet had no quarrel. This was the achievement of Bismarck's firm and consistent policy. A few days after he had dropped the veteran pilot, the youthful Kaiser telegraphed to the Grand Duke of Saxe-Weimar, "To me has fallen the post of Officer of the Watch upon the Ship of State. We shall follow the old course; and now—full steam ahead." In the course of the following fourteen years, during which the Kaiser assumed personal direction of Germany's foreign policy, the ship moved rapidly, but upon an uncertain and zigzag course, very different in fact from that which Bismarck had steered. At the very moment of Bismarck's resignation his inexperienced young master decided to omit the renewal of the "reinsurance treaties" with Russia and to support Austria more closely. The inevitable result was that Russia turned to France as an ally, and Italy eventually became less enthusiastic for an alliance in which her *irredentist* and Balkan hopes were likely to find scant support. A little later the Zanzibar-Heligoland Treaty with England (June 11, 1890), which during the negotiations had appeared to be a natural and friendly exchange of territories, was foreshadowed in its true light when the Kaiser proclaimed (August 10, 1890) to the people of Heligoland that "the island is destined to be a base for my war-ships, a defense for the German Ocean against every enemy who may force his way in and attempt to show himself there". It was the preliminary step to those naval schemes which he had not yet mentioned in his after-dinner speeches, but which were later to be the main source of that increasing distrust with which he came to be regarded in England.

During the first seven years Germany did not suffer seriously in prestige or position, in spite of frequent acts on the Kaiser's part, which seemed to manifest great friendliness or the reverse, first in one direction, then in another. The foreign offices of Europe were more astonished and perplexed than seriously alarmed. But during the next seven years, with the advent in 1897 of Admiral von Tirpitz as Naval Minister and of Count (now Prince) von Bülow as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the Kaiser's policy began to be

1917); T. Hayashi, *Secret Memoirs* (ed. A. M. Pooley, New York, 1915); B. E. Schmitt, *England and Germany, 1740-1915* (Princeton, 1916); and contemporary newspapers.

regarded in a more sinister light both by the public and by the responsible diplomats of the other Powers.

At the opening of the momentous year 1904, the net result of German diplomacy since Bismarck's fall was that Germany found herself in a much less comfortable position than fourteen years earlier. Through a number of episodes which there is here no opportunity to explain, she had shaken the confidence of her neighbors and brought on a situation in which her prestige was diminished. Aside from domestic difficulties, such as an over-extended system of credit, the increasing defiance of the government by the Social Democrats, and the colonial scandals culminating in the terrible Herero Rebellion, neither von Bülow's clever speeches in the Reichstag nor a duly inspired newspaper press could conceal unpleasant truths. The Triple Alliance was no longer what it used to be in Bismarck's day. France, with her new three-year army law, her loyal Russian ally, and her growing friendship with England, was stronger than at any time since 1870. The United States, with a navy which was not negligible, had shown her determination to uphold the Monroe Doctrine. Japan, with her English ally, and her new army and navy, modelled on the best that German and English experience could suggest, was a powerful commercial rival in the Far East. England, in cordial relations with France and Italy as well as with the United States and Japan, was suddenly beginning to wake up to the necessity of an increase in naval construction which would keep her far ahead of the German fleet.

On February 6, 1904, the Powers were taken by surprise by Japan's attack on Russia and by the prospect of great unforeseen changes in the Far East and of possible consequent complications in Europe. On April 8 the Anglo-French Entente Cordiale was signed, giving notice to the world that France and England were at last fast friends and that Morocco was henceforth a field in which the special interests of France were as definitely recognized as those of England in Egypt. To the Kaiser and von Bülow this was the last straw. Something must be done. In their minds the most important thing to do was to dislocate the Entente Cordiale and nullify its power before it should solidify into a formal alliance. Two methods might be used. The first was a secret intrigue with the Tsar which would draw Russia over into the orbit of German policy; this would result either in drawing France also and in establishing a German-Russian-French combination directed against England; or it would result in rupturing the Dual Alliance and leave England and France face to face with the old Triple Alliance, now reinsured again, as in Bismarck's day, on the Russian side. To

Germany it did not make a great difference which of these consequences would result, for in either case, Germany's position would be strengthened and she would win the prestige of a diplomatic success. The second method of dislocating the Entente Cordiale was by some diplomatic triumph over France, backed up by a policy of force, which would make patent to all the world the essential hollowness of the Entente Cordiale and proclaim that important arrangements in the world still could not be made without consulting Germany. These two methods, the one secret and the other open, used alternately and in combination, during the next fifteen months, in a series of manoeuvres of extraordinary interest and intricacy, are the true explanation of the Kaiser's secret interview at Björkö and his public speech at Tangiers. The secret diplomacy with the Tsar dovetails most interestingly with the better known crises in the Morocco affair.

In the early spring of 1904, on account of trouble with his throat, the Kaiser took an extended vacation in the Mediterranean on board the *Hohenzollern*. It was there that he heard of the signing of the Entente Cordiale on April 8. It was not long before the first notes of the Moroccan policy—the threat of force—were heard. Returning from the sunny south through Baden, the Kaiser, in a speech at Karlsruhe on April 28, sought to turn the German mind from the disappointing present to the glorious past, yet added:

You have rightly suggested that the task of the German people is a heavy one. Let us think of the great epoch when German Unity was created, of the battles of Wörth, Weissenburg, and Sedan. . . . I hope that peace will not be disturbed and that the events which we see taking place before our eyes tend to fix feelings in one direction, to clear the eye, to steel the courage, and to make us united, if it should be necessary for us to interfere in the policy of the world, so that peace will not be disturbed.<sup>6</sup>

On May 1, in inaugurating a bridge at Mainz, he spoke again and still more clearly:

I wish from my heart that peace, which is necessary for the further development of industry and trade, may be maintained in the future. But I am convinced that this bridge will prove completely adequate, if it has to be used for more serious transport purposes.<sup>7</sup>

On May 14, at Saarbrücken, he struck the same note. After congratulating himself that the town in which he was speaking had ceased, thanks to German victories, to be a frontier town, he emphasized German duty to the Fatherland and expressed his "rock-

<sup>6</sup> *Reden*, III. 203.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 204.

fast conviction that we have a clear conscience, and do not look for trouble anywhere, God knows, and He will stand by us if ever our peacefulness is attacked by hostile power".<sup>8</sup>

Then for ten months no act followed these words. The world was reassured, especially as Prince von Bülow, with characteristic dissimulation, appeared to be as little disturbed by the Anglo-French agreement as he had been by that between France and Italy two years before. On the contrary, as we shall see, he took pains to state that no German interests in Morocco were threatened. The method to be first employed to dislocate the Entente Cordiale was not after all a threat of force in Morocco, but secret diplomacy with the Tsar.

From Karlsruhe, Mainz, and Saarbrücken, the Kaiser went on to Kiel to take part in the aquatic sports in which he takes such a genuine delight. At this regatta of 1904, in which yachts of many countries took part, it had been arranged that Edward VII. should be present. The English king and his imperial nephew saw much of each other during those gala days, and had ample opportunity to discuss fully the European situation. Nothing apparently could be more friendly than their outward cordiality. On June 25 William II. heartily welcomed "Uncle Bertie" as honorary admiral of the German fleet,

which is the latest creation among the fleets of the world and an expression of the reviving sea power of the German Empire recreated by the great emperor. Destined for the protection of its trade and its territories, it also serves, like the German army, to maintain peace which the German empire together with Europe has maintained for over thirty years.

Everyone knows, too, Your Majesty's words and work, that Your Majesty's whole effort is also directed toward this goal—toward the maintenance of peace. As I also have steadily set my whole strength to reach this goal, may God give success to our efforts.<sup>9</sup>

There were here no boasting words and no threats of force such as the Kaiser had used a few weeks before on the Rhine.

The Kiel meeting made also a generally excellent impression on the press and people of Germany. The substance of some hundreds of columns of press comment was that the hearty manifestations on both sides attested a mutual desire to establish friendly relations between England and Germany. The regatta seemed to complete the soothing effect which von Bülow's optimistic and unconcerned references to the Entente Cordiale were calculated to exert. At the beginning of the summer holidays, the indignation and suspicions in Germany caused by the Anglo-French agreement of April 8

<sup>8</sup> *Reden*, III. 206.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 210.



seemed to have calmed down. King Edward's visit was followed by the signing between England and Germany of one of those relatively inconsequential arbitration treaties by which disputes which cannot be settled through the ordinary diplomatic channels are to be referred to the Hague Tribunal, "except those touching the vital interests, independence, or honor of the contracting parties".

Yet some of the newspapers in Germany did not conceal how much they were impressed with the ease and command with which King Edward moved about among his German hosts. Surely this man was no mere constitutional puppet, such as German teaching had represented the limited monarch of England to be. Such a man as King Edward must surely exercise a very real, direct, personal influence, not only on his own ministers and on English policy, but also upon the other sovereigns of Europe with whom he came in contact in his frequent visits to the Continent. This could scarcely have been pleasant reading to William II. with his passion for unrivalled pre-eminence. For him it now became a question whether he or his uncle could exercise the greater influence over Nicholas II. It was on the day of the final banquet at Kiel, June 29, 1904, that William decided to attempt to reknit the old, close, Bismarckian ties with Russia, by sending off the first of the Willy-Nicky telegrams:

From KIEL, the 16th of June, 1904.

*Sa Majesté l'Empereur:*

Uncle Albert's visit going, of course, well. . . . His wish for peace is quite pronounced, and is the motive for his liking to offer his services wherever he sees collisions in the world. The weather is simply disgusting. Best love to Alice. Sympathise sincerely with your fresh losses of ships and men.

WILLY, A. of A.<sup>10</sup>

This first telegram was merely the friendly opening of the way for more important political messages. Yet in this first telegram, in view of what followed, one wonders whether King Edward's "liking to offer his services wherever he sees collisions in the world" was not an innuendo designed to start a rankling suspicion in the Tsar's mind, that England might interfere in the Russo-Japanese War to protect her ally and spoil Russia's military hopes. During 1904, especially in the spring and summer, it was generally felt, not only in Russia but in Germany and elsewhere, that Russian arms, as in so many previous wars, after initial disasters and disappoint-

<sup>10</sup> *WNC.*, p. 47; the date printed is probably that on which the telegram was received and marked in accordance with Russian custom, and is therefore Old Style. It cannot, of course, be June 16, New Style, for on that day the Kaiser was in Homburg, in Hesse, and King Edward had not arrived at Kiel.

ments would in the end achieve victory. After the disadvantage of being taken by surprise had been overcome by the sending of an adequate number of troops over the Trans-Siberian railway, the tide would begin to turn again in Russia's favor. Until that time came, Russia wanted no interference.<sup>11</sup> The more he turned the Tsar's mind against England, the more the Kaiser would throw him into the arms of Germany.

A fortnight after this first telegram, William II. sought to further his secret diplomacy by a courteous act which should create a friendly sentiment among the Russian public. He sent an open telegram, July 10, to the Russian commander of the Viborg Infantry Regiment, of which he was honorary colonel, congratulating them on their prospect of soon meeting the enemy. It caused a good deal of surprise and comment in the European press and led a considerable part of the public to conjecture that the recent Kiel meeting with King Edward had resulted in some agreement that Germany should intervene to stop the progress of the war. As this would have been unwelcome in Russia, those German newspapers which ventured this conjecture were speedily and sternly rebuked by Prince von Bülow's organ, the *Süddeutsche Reichskorrespondenz*.<sup>12</sup>

The Viborg telegram was probably also designed to facilitate the negotiations for a new commercial treaty between Germany and Russia. The old treaties had not been favorable to Germany. Von Bülow might hope that the moment was opportune for their revision. Russia's embarrassment in the Far East, her need of obtaining money on the German market, and her desire for Germany's benevolent neutrality might presumably make her willing to make considerable tariff concessions, in the direction so clamorously desired by the German agrarian party. It augured well that it was Witte, regarded as Germanophile and now president of the Russian Council of Ministers, who came in person to Berlin on July 12 and then passed many hours in conference with von Bülow at the latter's summer residence at Norderney. In view of the fact that it was the Russian minister president and not the minister of finance who had come supposedly to negotiate the commercial treaty,<sup>13</sup> and in view of Witte's persistent disinclination to state the object of his visit, one may surmise that in the long confidential talks between the two

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Reventlow, p. 236.

<sup>12</sup> "It proudly affirmed that Russia would not allow her confidence in German neutrality to be shaken by reports of this kind, since she knows that she possesses in Germany a safe neighbor and a true friend" (summary in *London Times*, July 13, 1904).

<sup>13</sup> Nicky to Willy, August 3, 1904 (*WNC.*, p. 50): "Saw Mr. Witte, who reported the conclusion of the treaty with Count Bülow."



leading ministers, high matters of general European policy as well as the duty on bushels of wheat found a place.

Meanwhile, a week after the close of the Kiel regatta, the Kaiser started on the *Hohenzollern* on his annual summer cruise among the wonderful fjords of Norway. During this cruise, which lasted from July 6 to August 10, an incident occurred which threatened greatly to arouse irritation between Russia and Germany, and thus make much more difficult the *rapprochement* which the Kaiser now had so much at heart. A Russian steamer, the *Smolensk*, of uncertain status though called a "cruiser", had held up the North German Lloyd steamer *Prinz Heinrich* in the Red Sea and carried off the mail bags containing correspondence for Japan. The Kaiser realized how his plans would be jeopardized if this kind of thing should continue, and instantly telegraphed to the Tsar,

This act, a violation of international law, will create great surprise and disgust in Germany, considering the friendly feeling shown to Russia by our country, and, if repeated, will, I fear, contribute to considerably reduce the sympathy still cherished for your country by Germany.<sup>14</sup>

The Tsar hastened to express his regrets at this excess and *trope de zele* [*sic*] of the *Smolensk* and promised that it should not happen again, for it "would be sad if one episode were to spoil the excellent relations existing between our countries".<sup>15</sup>

During the following summer weeks, the Kaiser continued from time to time to show little acts of friendliness or send secret telegrams which he hoped would bind the pliant and unsuspecting Tsar more closely to him. He condoled with Nicky upon General Keller's sudden death.<sup>16</sup> He gave to a certain Baron von der Wenge the title, Count Lamsdorf, and attached him as special military attaché to the person of Nicholas II.; the Tsar did the same with Schebeko for the Kaiser.<sup>17</sup> This arrangement was a revival of one which pre-

<sup>14</sup> *WNC.*, p. 51, July 18. Prince von Bülow also protested through the German Foreign Office.

<sup>15</sup> *WNC.*, pp. 51-52. Some other cases did occur, but were apologized for in the same manner and remained without serious consequences.

<sup>16</sup> *WNC.*, p. 49. The date printed on no. 2, "From Nordfjordeidet, the 20th of June, 1904", cannot be correct for, whether O. S. or N. S., the Kaiser was still in Germany. Furthermore Count Keller was not killed till July 31, the news appearing in the European papers the next day. Probably "20th of June" was misread for "20th of July" by the editors. This would make the correct date, N. S., August 2, 1904. Telegrams 2 and 3 should therefore properly come between telegrams 9 and 10.

<sup>17</sup> *WNC.*, p. 71. Cf. *London Times*, October 24, 1904. It is supposed that the Kaiser was also attempting in this matter to pay a delicate compliment to the great Count Vladimir Lamsdorf, the Russian minister of foreign affairs at this

vailed for many years between Prussia and Russia before 1890. It was no mere form. These military attachés, who bore also the title "military plenipotentiary", were constantly in the neighborhood of the sovereigns to whom they were attached, and were used to carry confidential letters and verbal messages back and forth between their rulers.<sup>18</sup> They were also treated as if they were officers of the ruler's own staff. Their revival after an interval of many years was regarded by the *Vossische Zeitung* as "a symptom of renewed warmth between Germany and Russia, which since the days of Alexander III. has been very cool". Others, similarly, believed it to be "the outward and visible sign of the close personal bond uniting both sovereigns. It implies, if not the existence of a new reinsurance treaty, at any rate a condition of close relationship rendering such a treaty unnecessary".<sup>19</sup> The journalists little knew how close they were to the real truth.

As the Russo-Japanese War progressed even more unfavorably for the Tsar, the Kaiser began to give him naval and military advice, as he claims to have done to the English in the Boer War.<sup>20</sup> Twice in the same telegram, he strongly advises that the Russian fleet, bottled up at Port Arthur, should

make a try for the Japanese fleet, and if they manage to run down or smash or damage the four lines of battleships left to Japan, though they themselves may perish, too, they will have done their duty, shattering the strength of the Japanese sea power and preparing the way for the Baltic fleet's victorious success on its arrival, in winning easily against a damaged antagonist unable to repair his ships or build new ones in time. Then the sea power is back in your hands and the Japanese land forces are at your mercy; then you sound the "general advance" for your army and the enemy. Hallali!<sup>21</sup>

Two weeks later, on October 19, while encouraging Nicholas to plunge boldly and rapidly on, before the crafty but exhausted Japanese could bear off the fruits of victory, the Kaiser at the same

time. But if so, he was, according to Nekludov (pp. 136-137), singularly infelicitous. The great Count Lamsdorf came of an old German Lutheran family of the Baltic provinces, perhaps distantly related by blood to the new military attaché.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *WNC.*, pp. 58, 71, 89, 145-147.

<sup>19</sup> How important the Kaiser deemed the new arrangement to be may be seen by his eager argument for its continuance when the Tsar, his eyes at last opened to the Kaiser's plot, questioned whether they should not drop it (December 30, 1905, *WNC.*, pp. 146-147).

<sup>20</sup> In the famous "interview" in the *Daily Telegraph*, October 28, 1908; for the story of how this indiscretion on the Kaiser's part passed the Chancellor and the whole German Foreign Office, see Hammer, pp. 215-226.

<sup>21</sup> October 8, 1904. *WNC.*, pp. 57-58.

time was seeking to sow suspicion in the Tsar's mind against France and especially against England:

I have information from good source that former Japanese Minister at Petersburg, Kurino, has reappeared in Europe. He is in Paris, and seems to be authorised to try to get France and England, l'entente cordiale, to mediate in favour of Japan for peace. It seems also as if the Chinese were being pushed forward by Japan to offer to mediate on their part, too. This shows that Japan is nearing the limits of its strength in men and money, and now that they have gained advantages over the Manchurian army they fancy that they can stop now and try to reap the fruits of their efforts by enticing other Powers to mix themselves in the matter and to get at Manchuria by peace conference. . . . I thought it my duty to inform you of what seems going on behind the scenes. I think the strings of all these doings lead across the Channel.<sup>22</sup>

Whether the Kaiser's encouragement had any influence on the feverish haste and nervousness with which the Baltic fleet under Rodjestvensky started for the Far East, or whether the Kaiser was deliberately pushing the Tsar forward in his disastrous Asiatic adventure, in order to weaken his position in Europe, are questions which lack of space forbids me to discuss. There can be no doubt, however, that Germany's relative diplomatic position in Europe was improved, when the Tsar's hands were tied by the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War. The departure of Rodjestvensky's fleet not only opened the possibility of new business for German ship-building firms, but, what was far more important, it would leave the German fleet for many years to come supreme in the Baltic, unrivalled by any naval power except that of England. And England's exclusion from the Baltic was, as we shall see, soon to be provided for. It seemed at last that the much-coveted *dominium maris Baltici* might virtually fall into German hands and open the way perhaps for the Pan-Germans to strengthen their hold on the Baltic Provinces and even reach out toward Finland. There is much in the Willy-Nicky correspondence which seems to support such a view of the Kaiser's perfidy toward a weak ruler who had put faith in a "loyal friendship which I trust beyond anything". On the other hand, it is possible that the Kaiser still honestly believed, as did many military critics in Germany, that Russia would prevail and that "the Baltic fleet on arrival will only have to finish the rest of the hostile ships off".<sup>23</sup>

But whatever opinion one may hold about the sincerity and dis-

<sup>22</sup> October 19, 1904. *WNC.*, pp. 61-62. The Tsar replied that he also had heard about Japan's activity, but "cannot quite make out whether the strings of these doings lead across the Channel or perhaps the Atlantic . . . May God help us. Hearty thanks for your loyal friendship, which I trust beyond anything."

<sup>23</sup> *WNC.*, p. 58.

interestedness of the Kaiser's advice to the Tsar in the fall of 1904, there can be no doubt that he did his utmost to exploit the Tsar's difficult situation for his own diplomatic advantage by attempting to draw the Tsar into a secret alliance. The Dogger Bank incident, in which Russian naval officers gave a painful exhibition of their nervousness by firing into an English fishing fleet which they mistook for Japanese torpedo-boats, greatly excited public feeling in England and Russia. The Kaiser instantly seized upon this unfortunate incident as the favorable moment for definitely hinting, for the first time, at the scheme of a Russo-German alliance, which, though thwarted for a while by the Tsar's scruples, finally ripened to success at Björkö. On October 27, 1904, he telegraphed to the Tsar:

For some time English press has been threatening Germany on no account to allow coals to be sent to Baltic fleet now on its way out. It is not impossible that the Japanese and British governments may lodge a joint protest against our coaling your ships, coupled with a summation [*sic*] to stop further work. The result aimed at by such a threat of war would be the absolute immobility of your fleet and inability to proceed to its destination for want of fuel. This new danger would have to be faced in community by Russia and Germany together, who would both have to remind your ally, France, of obligations she has taken over in the treaty of dual alliance with you, the "*casus foederis*". It is out of the question that France, on such an invitation, would try to shirk her implicit duty toward her ally. Though Delcassé is an anglophile "*enragé*", he will be wise enough to understand that the British fleet is utterly unable to save Paris. In this way a powerful combination of three of the strongest Continent Powers would be formed, to attack whom the Anglo-Japanese group would think twice before acting. . . . The naval battles fought by Togo are fought with Cardiff coals. . . . I am sorry for the mishap in the North Sea.<sup>24</sup>

Simple Nicky easily fell into the snare, replying immediately,

I agree fully with your complaints about England's behaviour concerning the coaling of our ships by German steamers, whereas she understands the rules of keeping neutrality in her own fashion. It is certainly high time to put a stop to this. The only way, as you say, would be that Germany, Russia, and France should at once unite upon an arrangement to abolish Anglo-Japanese arrogance and insolence. Would you like to lay down and frame the outlines of such a treaty and let me know it? As soon as accepted by us France is bound to join her ally. This combination has often come to my mind; it will mean peace and rest for the world.<sup>25</sup>

The Kaiser lost no time in supplying the draft of the treaty which he himself so much desired, adding a rumor that there had been foul

<sup>24</sup> *WNC.*, pp. 68-70.

<sup>25</sup> October 29, 1904. *WNC.*, pp. 74-75.

play against the Russian fleet at the Dogger Bank affair, intended to excite the Tsar against England, and frighten him into a hasty acceptance of the treaty.<sup>26</sup>

Nicholas, however, in his simple-minded honesty, had accepted ingenuously the idea that France was to be included in the treaty. We do not know the terms of the draft treaty, since it was sent by messenger instead of telegraph. It evidently, however, did not include France. Nicholas, therefore, hesitated to act behind the back of his faithful ally. To overcome his hesitation, the Kaiser continued to ply him with new rumors as to England's perfidy.<sup>27</sup> But the Tsar still hesitated, and finally, in his honest innocence, made a suggestion which shows how little he understood the import of the Kaiser's machination:

Before signing the last draft of treaty I think it advisable to let the French see it. As long as it is not signed one can make small modifications in the text, whereas if already approved by us both it will seem as if we tried to enforce the treaty on France. In this case a failure might easily happen, which, I think, is neither your wish. Therefore I ask your agreement to acquaint the government of France with this project.<sup>28</sup>

As the Tsar's ingenuous suggestion would have been fatal to the Kaiser's ultimate purpose, the Kaiser vehemently tried to argue and frighten him out of it:

It is my firm conviction that it would be absolutely dangerous to inform France before we both have signed the treaty. It would have an effect diametrically opposed to our wishes. It is only the absolute sure knowledge that we are both bound by treaty to lend each other mutual help that will bring the French to press upon England to remain quiet and keep the peace for fear of France's position being jeopardized. Should, however, France know that a Russian-German treaty is only projected, but still unsigned, she will immediately give short notice to her friend (if not secret ally) England, with whom she is bound by "entente cordiale", and inform her immediately. The outcome of such information would doubtless be an instantaneous attack by the two allied Powers, England and Japan, on Germany in Europe as well as in Asia. Their enormous maritime superiority would soon make short work of my small fleet and Germany would be temporarily crippled. This would upset the scales of the equilibrium of the world to our mutual harm, and, later on, when you begin your peace negotiations, throw you alone on the tender mercies of Japan and her jubilant and overwhelming friends. It was my special wish—and, as I understand, your intention, too—to maintain and strengthen this endangered equilibrium of the world through expressly the agreement between Russia, Germany, and France.

<sup>26</sup> October 30, 1904. *WNC.*, p. 76.

<sup>27</sup> Long telegrams of November 15 and 19, 1904. *WNC.*, pp. 77-81.

<sup>28</sup> November 23, 1904. *WNC.*, p. 83.

... A previous information of France will lead to a catastrophe. Should you, notwithstanding, think it impossible for you to conclude a treaty with me without the previous consent of France, then it would be a far safer alternative to abstain from concluding any treaty at all.<sup>29</sup>

But the Tsar was not to be convinced. After some further correspondence by wire and by letter, the most to which he was willing to bind himself was a coaling agreement embodied in an exchange of notes. This took place on December 11 and 12, 1904, between the German ambassador in Petrograd, Count von Alvensleben, and the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Count Lamsdorf.<sup>30</sup> The text of these notes is not in the Willy-Nicky correspondence, but was published in German in the semi-official *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, September 12, 1917, as follows:

ST. PETERSBURG, November 28/December 11, 1904. The recent measures of the English government, whereby steamers which are loading coal in English ports have been hindered from putting to sea with their cargoes, demonstrate clearly and plainly that England regards and treats as a breach of neutrality the conduct which the merchant ships of neutral Powers are observing in providing coal for the Baltic fleet. On August 15 of this year, Lord Lansdowne informed the ambassador of His Majesty the Kaiser, in London, that in case Japan by reason of the breach of neutrality on the part of Germany were to take up arms, England would, on the request of the Japanese government, regard the case as coming within the meaning of the Alliance.

From its side the Japanese government makes known through the semi-official press that it will appeal to force against acts which in its opinion constitute breaches of neutrality on the part of a foreign Power, and that it will no longer respect the neutrality of that power.

From this it is apparent that Germany is threatened with a conflict with both of the Powers in question, namely, England and Japan. The Imperial Government therefore is under the necessity of putting to the Imperial Russian Government the question whether it will undertake to stand by Germany with all means at its disposal, in all difficulties which may arise as a result of coal deliveries to the Russian fleet during the present war.

Should it not be possible for the Imperial Russian Government to give its assurance to the Imperial Government in this sense, then the German Government will be under the necessity in regard to the supplying of coal of taking measures without delay such as are necessary for the safety of the Empire. The Imperial Government will have to take these measures without delay at the time of the arrival of the fleet under Admiral Rodjestvensky in Madagascar, in case the assurance in question has not then been received by the German Government.

On the following day, December 12, Lamsdorf, by the Tsar's command, gave the formal assurance,

<sup>29</sup> November 26, 1904. *WNC.*, pp. 85-87.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *WNC.*, pp. 95-96.

that the Russian Government is resolved fully to stand by the Imperial German Government in the question of the deliveries of coal, in the firm conviction that the latter on its side, as Your Excellency confirmed to me yesterday, will observe the same friendly attitude which it has hitherto shown, and that it will facilitate the deliveries of coal to the Russian fleet.

The fall of Port Arthur on January 1, 1905, which the Kaiser had probably not expected,<sup>31</sup> and the consequent loss of the Russian ships which had been bottled up there, now made very hazardous the fate of the Baltic fleet if it should venture to proceed from Madagascar to the Far East. German colliers which undertook to accompany it ran a great risk of being sunk or captured. Therefore, the Kaiser was no longer eager to deliver coal from colliers flying the German flag. He took refuge in the theory that the coaling question was a purely private business matter of the Hamburg-American Line. He also now suggested that Russia *buy* the colliers, whereby Germany would escape the risk of loss. But the Russians naturally did not want to buy, and gave as one pretext that they had no crews to man colliers.<sup>32</sup> Irritated by the situation into which he had brought himself, of having made an agreement to "facilitate the deliveries of coal to the Russian fleet" which he was now unwilling to live up to, when it ceased to be for his interest to do so, the Kaiser abruptly ended the telegrams to Nicky. He turned instead to the Morocco affair, and did not begin them again until he had scored what he regarded as a first triumph over France.

To see the full significance of the Björkö interview, it is necessary to recall some facts in the Morocco affair. On March 23, 1904, fifteen days before the signing of the Anglo-French Entente Cordiale, M. Delcassé had courteously informed the German ambassador at Paris, Prince von Radolin, of the tenor of the new agreement with England, so that the German government should not think France was trying to surprise them. The ambassador replied that he found the arrangement "very natural and perfectly justified".<sup>33</sup> When it had been signed, Prince von Bülow took pains to state in the Reichstag, April 12, 1904:

We have no cause to apprehend that this agreement is levelled against any individual power. It seems to be an attempt to eliminate the points of difference between France and Great Britain by means of an amicable understanding. From the point of view of German interests we have no objection to make to it.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *WNC.*, pp. 57, 77-78.

<sup>32</sup> *WNC.*, pp. 96-100.

<sup>33</sup> Tardieu, *France and the Alliances*, pp. 171-172.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 168, 172.



Trusting to this, and other official statements by the German chancellor, and discounting the Kaiser's threatening utterances, M. Delcassé had made the mistake of failing to secure promptly for France, by agreements with Spain and with the Sultan of Morocco, the reforms in Morocco contemplated by the Anglo-French Entente of April 8. If he had done so and presented Germany with a *fait accompli*, perhaps Prince von Bülow would have prudently adhered to the attitude which he at first announced. But M. Delcassé had allowed many months to slip by, during which it became clear that France was weakened by domestic troubles as well as by the disasters which were rendering her Russian ally powerless in Europe.

When, therefore, it was clear that the Kaiser's secret diplomacy had failed to win the Tsar to an alliance after the Dogger Bank incident, it was decided that von Bülow should use Morocco as a weapon against France. In contradiction with the attitude which he had expressed in April, 1904, at the time when the Entente Cordiale was signed, he now took the opposite position, that German interests were threatened by the French in Morocco, after all. The first indication that the soft persuasive notes of the secret-diplomacy flute had been laid aside in favor of the noisy Tangiers kettledrum came on February 11, 1905, at the moment when the Kaiser's irritation over the coaling business had put a temporary cessation to the correspondence with Nicholas. On that day Herr von Kühlmann, Germany's chargé d'affaires at Tangiers, complained to his French colleague,

We find that we have been systematically kept ignorant of what was going on. . . . I thought it my duty to ask my government for formal instructions. Count von Bülow thereupon informed me that the Imperial Government had no knowledge of the different agreements that had been made with reference to Morocco, and did not recognize that he was in any way bound as regards the situation.<sup>35</sup>

This surprising prelude, followed by a *crescendo* of assertions by the German consul in Fez (February 21), and by Prince von Bülow in the Reichstag (March 16 and 29), came to a resounding *finale* on March 31 in the Kaiser's famous appearance and ominous remarks at Tangiers.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Tardieu, *France and the Alliances*, p. 171. Kühlmann's complaint was made on February 11; the Kaiser's final irritated telegram on the coaling business was of February 15, 1905 (*WNC.*, pp. 100-101).

<sup>36</sup> Into the large question of the motives and honesty of Germany's Morocco policy of 1905, I cannot here enter. Cf. on one side, Reventlow, pp. 219-280, and von Bülow's own statements to French journalists published in the *Petit Parisien* and the *Temps*, early in October, 1905; on the other side, the comment in the French press, in the London *Times* (especially editorial of October 5, 1905), and the works of Tardieu and Mévil.



The "Morocco Crisis" ensued and alarmed Europe for weeks. Prince von Bülow seemed to have scored a success in forcing the resignation of M. Delcassé on June 6 and the acceptance by M. Rouvier, two days later, of the principle that Moroccan affairs should be settled by a conference of the Powers.<sup>37</sup>

There were, however, clouds on the horizon. It was uncertain how far England would be willing to see France humiliated. The outcome of the peace negotiations which President Roosevelt was arranging at Portsmouth was still problematical. The separation of Norway from Sweden and the search for a suitable ruler for Norway raised vital questions as to the Baltic which ought to be settled with the Tsar. Altogether the situation in July, 1905, seemed to invite and demand on the Kaiser's part another effort toward the Tsar. Secret diplomacy began again.

It happened by design or chance that in 1905 the Kaiser's summer cruise was not directed as usual among the fjords of Norway but to the Swedish coasts in the Baltic. At Gefle, on July 13, William II. discussed the European situation with the King and Crown Prince of Sweden on board the *Hohenzollern*. On July 19, from a Swedish port north of Stockholm, he casually telegraphed to Nicky,

I shall shortly be on my return journey and cannot pass across entrance of the Finnish Sea without sending you best love and wishes. Should it give you any pleasure to see me—either on shore or your yacht—of course am always at your disposal.

Nicky was "delighted".

Would it suit you to meet me at Bjoerkesund, near Viborg, a pleasant, quiet place, living on board our yachts?<sup>38</sup>

Arrangements were speedily made as to a trustworthy pilot and the exact time and place,<sup>39</sup> and on Sunday evening, July 23, the Kaiser had the pleasure of the tableau he had anticipated.

Of the secret interview which took place between the Kaiser and the Tsar on Monday, July 24, there is of course no narrative in the Willy-Nicky correspondence, but from a variety of sources one can

<sup>37</sup> Tardieu, *La Conférence d'Algésiras*, pp. 481-484. The only question that then remained was the scope of the subjects which should be submitted for discussion at the conference. Here a serious hitch occurred, until M. Witte appeared as a *deus ex machina*.

<sup>38</sup> *WNC.*, pp. 104-105.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 104-109.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIV.—5.

piece together pretty accurately what took place.<sup>40</sup> No other persons except the emperors were present at the main part of the interview. The Kaiser began by relating the news which he had picked up from King Oscar of Sweden, being careful to omit no touch which would arouse the fears in his timid listener, and excite his suspicions against the members of the Dual Entente, especially against England. The Kaiser mentioned that King Oscar was indifferent as to who should be chosen the new King of Norway; the king even had no objections to a republic. At this, poor Nicky threw his hands over his head, exclaiming, "And that, too! Well, that was the only thing lacking [colloquially, 'This is the last straw']". As if we had not already republics enough in the world."<sup>41</sup> Nicky then suggested that if King Oscar was not ambitious to put a Swedish prince in Norway, and if the Danish family was interested in the matter, "Prince Waldemar might be sent";<sup>42</sup> he has had some experience of life, has an elegant, nice wife, and fine, strapping children." The Kaiser appeared to agree, but deftly mentioned "private information from Copenhagen" that "the King of England has already given out his approval of the election of his son-in-law."<sup>43</sup> The Tsar was very disagreeably taken by surprise at this news, and remarked,

My cousin Charles is absolutely unsuited for this position. He has never been anywhere and has no experience of life and is indolent. Waldemar would be much better. If it is to be Charles, England "by fair means or foul" will stick her finger in Norwegian affairs, gain influence, begin intrigues, and finally by the occupation of Christiansand close the Skagerack and shut us all out from the Baltic, and thereby the Murman ports in the north will be settled.<sup>44</sup>

Then the question of Denmark was discussed at length. The Tsar, according to the Kaiser's account, asked what measures they

<sup>40</sup> (a) From the Kaiser's telegram to von Bülow the next day, published in the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, September 13, 1917; (b) from the Kaiser's explanation to the Tsar (August 2, 1905, *WNC.*, pp. 117-121) of why he did not tell the King of Denmark how the Björkö agreement threatened that small state; and (c) from Izvolsky's recollections published in the *Matin*, September 15, 1917.

<sup>41</sup> "Auch das noch! Na, das fehlte gerade noch. Als ob wir nicht schon genug Republiken in der Welt hätten". Kaiser to von Bülow, July 25, in *Nordd. Allg. Zeitung*, September 13, 1917.

<sup>42</sup> Waldemar, younger son of Christian IX. of Denmark, was the brother of Queen Alexandra, mother of George V. of England, and also brother of the dowager Tsarina Maria, mother of Nicholas II.

<sup>43</sup> Charles, grandson of Christian IX. and younger son of Frederick VIII., born 1872, elected King of Norway under the title of Haakon VII. in November, 1905.

<sup>44</sup> Kaiser to von Bülow, July 25, 1905. *Nordd. Allg. Zeitung*, September 13, 1917.

could take to assist King Christian and guarantee his position in his country, so that they themselves could be certain in case of war of maintaining the defense of the Baltic north of the Belts.

A declaration of neutrality would do us no good, if, at the same time, the Danes, according to their views, considered it right to pilot enemy vessels straight into the Baltic before our ports. The enemy, in case he does not respect the neutrality of Denmark, which is to be assumed considering the great weakness of the little country, would lay hands on it and it would be compelled to take sides with the enemy and furnish him with an excellent base for operations against our coasts. Denmark is now only a Baltic State and not a North Sea Power.

How far the Tsar was here giving original views of his own, and how far merely echoing the ideas which the Kaiser had put into his head, does not appear with certainty.<sup>45</sup> At any rate, they had no difficulty in coming to an understanding that

In case of war and impending attack on the Baltic from the foreign Power . . . Russia and Germany will immediately take steps to safeguard their interests by laying hand on Denmark and occupying it during the war.<sup>46</sup>

The Kaiser on his way back to Germany from Björkö was to break the news gently to King Christian.

Having arranged amicably for the fate of this small nation and for the exclusion of English enemy ships from the Baltic, the Kaiser then came to the really important matter. He drew forth and handed to the Tsar a treaty of alliance between Germany and Russia. Whether the Tsar hesitated, we do not know. But we do know that in the course of this secret interview he did sign a formal treaty in the following terms:

Their Imperial Majesties, the Emperor of All the Russias on the one side, and the German Emperor on the other, in order to insure the peace of Europe, have placed themselves in accord on the following points of the herein treaty relative to a defensive alliance:

Art. I. If any European state attacks one of the two empires, the allied party engages to aid the other contracting party with all his military and naval forces.

<sup>45</sup> In his account of the interview to von Bülow, the Kaiser said, "I could not, to be sure, accept his views as my own, but promised to consider the matter with you. In Copenhagen, I will question Schoen [the German ambassador], and see what conception of neutrality is held there." But was the Kaiser being quite honest even with his Chancellor? There is no hint in this telegram, as published by the *Nordd. Allg. Zeitung*, that any treaty was signed at Björkö. Either the Kaiser in 1905 was concealing a most important matter from his Chancellor (as the Tsar concealed it for some weeks from his chief ministers) or those responsible for publishing these documents in 1917 suppressed part of the telegram.

<sup>46</sup> *WNC.*, pp. 118-119.

Art. II. The high contracting parties engage not to conclude with any common enemy a separate peace.

Art. III. The present treaty will become effective from the moment of the conclusion of the peace between Russia and Japan and may be denounced with a year's previous notification.

Art. IV. When this treaty has become effective, Russia will undertake the necessary steps to inform France of it and to propose to the latter to adhere to it as an ally.

[Signed] NICHOLAS. WILLIAM.

[Countersigned] Von Tschirschky. Count Benkendorf.

Naval Minister, Birilev.<sup>47</sup>

Such was the Treaty of Björkö. It was not suddenly improvised on July 24, 1905. It was the culmination of plans which the Kaiser had had in view ever since the Kiel regatta in June, 1904. It was what he had aimed to secure in the fall of 1904 after the Dogger Bank episode, but, being then unsuccessful, he had accepted *faute de mieux* the coaling agreement. The Björkö Treaty was in form a defensive alliance, but, taken in connection with the understanding in regard to Denmark, was obviously directed against England. It was in conflict with the spirit of the Dual Alliance and would consequently have overthrown the foundation on which Russian foreign policy had rested since 1891. The specious provision for the adhesion of France was incapable of execution; as the situation then was. France, suddenly confronted by the united force of a Russo-German alliance, would have been compelled, as has already been suggested, to choose between two alternatives: either she would have had to subordinate herself as an impotent third party to a combination of two great empires, both dominated in fact by the Kaiser; or she would have been forced to give up the Dual Alliance and stand isolated (except so far as England offered support) before the Kaiser's menacing power. To the Kaiser it would have made little difference which alternative France chose. In either case he would have extricated Germany from that position of isolation into which his own unwise policy had brought her, he would have an ally in case of war with England, and Germany would again have weakened and humiliated France.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>47</sup> This treaty was published by the Bolsheviks in the Russian *Izvestiia*, December 29, 1917, copied in the Paris *Excelsior*, December 31, and, in slightly varying phraseology, by Bompard (pp. 425-426) and by Nekludov (p. 140). As the Kaiser insisted on the signature of witnesses, the men whose names appear were called in at the close of the interview and ordered to affix their signatures. Izvolsky heard afterward that they could not read the text of the document they were signing, because it was covered by the emperor's hand.

<sup>48</sup> If we may trust the recollection which Izvolsky set down in 1917 of the conversation which he had in 1905, it seems likely that the Kaiser expected

From Björkö the Kaiser sailed as agreed for Copenhagen, but on arriving said nothing to King Christian of the plan elaborated at Björkö. The reasons which he telegraphed to the Tsar for remaining silent are curious:

After my arrival I soon found out through reading the press reports—Danish and foreign—that a very strong current of mistrust and apprehension had been gendered against my visit, especially from England. The King had been so intimidated and public opinion so worked upon that I was unable to touch the question we had agreed I had to mention to him. . . . Also, considering the great number of channels leading from Copenhagen to London and the proverbial want of discretion at the Danish court, I was afraid to let anything be known about our alliance, as it would immediately have been communicated to London, a most impossible thing as long as the treaty is to remain secret for the present. By a long conversation with Isvolsky, however, I was able to gather that the actual Minister of Foreign Affairs, Count Raben, and a number of persons of influence have already come to the conviction that in case of war and impending attack on the Baltic from the foreign Power, the Danes expect—their inability and helplessness to uphold even the shadow of neutrality against an invasion being evident—that Russia and Germany will immediately take steps to safeguard their interests by laying hand on Denmark and occupying it during the war. As this would in the same time guarantee the territory and future existence of dynasty and country, the Danes are slowly resigning themselves to this alternative and making up their minds accordingly. This being exactly what you wished and hoped for, I thought it better not to touch the subject with the Danes.<sup>48a</sup>

Not the least interesting point in regard to the Björkö Treaty is what became of it. When the Tsar parted from the Kaiser at

France to accept the first alternative. Summoned one evening at the end of July to the German legation at Copenhagen, to talk with the Kaiser who was returning from Björkö, Izvolsky relates, "I was greatly struck by the insistence of William II. in explaining to me the necessity for an alliance between Russia, Germany, and France. 'A true guarantee of peace, of a solidly established peace, would be', he said, 'in the close collaboration of the three great Continental Powers; such an alliance would entirely exclude British hegemony and assure the blessings of peace to the world forever'. Challenged by the Emperor to give my opinion, I said, 'Sire, I have followed very attentively the explanation Your Majesty has been good enough to give me; nevertheless, the realization of this vast scheme appears to me quite impossible, because . . . of the question of Alsace-Lorraine.' 'I beg pardon, it is settled.' 'Sire, I do not understand.' 'Certainly it is settled. In the Morocco affair I threw down the gauntlet to France. France declined to pick it up. Therefore she refused to fight me. Consequently, the question of Alsace-Lorraine no longer exists between us.' . . .

"What could I reply", asks M. Izvolsky, "to such a *boutade*, which, after all, was perhaps only a *boutade*, though it clearly showed William's state of mind. This impression grew on me when he developed the idea that France must, so to speak, be forced to accept a Russo-German alliance, and in any case be brought in *volens nolens*." (Le Temps, September 15, 1917)<sup>4</sup>

<sup>48a</sup> August 2, 1905. WNC, pp. 117-119.

Björkö, he returned to Tsarskoe-Selo with the secret treaty in his possession, and laid it away, not mentioning its existence to anyone. But he could not long so leave it. For according to article III. of the treaty, it was to become effective at the conclusion of peace between Russia and Japan. This took place at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, on September 5. The Tsar therefore decided to inform Count Lamsdorf and the others who ought to know of its existence.<sup>49</sup> Count Lamsdorf "could not believe his eyes or ears". He instantly saw the danger for France and the necessity of nullifying the treaty. He explained to the Tsar the significance of what he had done. He made it clear how contrary the treaty was to the spirit of the Dual Alliance, and how unlikely it was that France could be forced, *volens nolens*, into such a triple combination. He re-enforced his own views by those of the Russian ambassador at Paris. The Tsar was finally convinced and instructed Lamsdorf to take steps to annul the treaty. Not trusting any further secret diplomacy between the sovereigns, Lamsdorf decided to entrust the Russian ambassador at Berlin, Count Osten-Sacken, with the disagreeable but necessary task of informing the Kaiser that the Treaty of Björkö was incompatible with Russia's obligations to France and therefore could not be executed.<sup>50</sup>

Great was the Kaiser's vexation when he received this communication. But he did not believe the treaty was yet lost—for he hoped that he had insured himself against failure by getting Witte's support for a triple combination between Germany, Russia, and France. Therefore, he refused to regard Osten-Sacken's communication as final, and despatched to the Tsar in quick succession the strongly worded telegrams of October 12 and 15, 1905. With arguments and appeals intended to hold the Tsar fast to his promise, he urged that the treaty did not collide with the Dual Alliance, and anyway,

Your ally has notoriously left you in the lurch during the whole war, whereas Germany helped you in every way as far as it could without infringing the laws of neutrality. That puts Russia morally also under obligations to us; *do ut des*. Meanwhile the indiscretions of Delcassé have shown the world that though France is your ally she nevertheless made an agreement with England and was on the verge of surprising Germany, with British help, in the middle of peace, while I was doing my best to you and your country, her ally. . . . Our Moroccan business is regulated to entire satisfaction, so that the air is free for better under-

<sup>49</sup> "Till now the Grand Duke Nicholas, the War Minister, the chief of General Staff, and Lamsdorff are informed about the treaty. Have nothing against your telling Witte about it". Nicky to Willy, September 24, 1905. *WNC.*, pp. 127-128.

<sup>50</sup> Nekludov, p. 141; cf. Bompard, pp. 433, 442-446.

standing between us. Our treaty is a very good base to build upon. We joined hands and signed before God, who heard our vows. I therefore think that the treaty can well come into existence. . . . What is signed is signed, and God is our testator.<sup>51</sup>

M. Witte had left St. Petersburg for America on July 19 two hours before the arrival of the Kaiser's suggestion for the Björkö meeting. He left Russia famed as a financier and a builder of the Trans-Siberian railway. He returned from Portsmouth with the added reputation of being a great diplomat, and no one was more conscious of his diplomatic success than M. Witte himself. He had long desired to see closer relations between the three great Continental Powers. In his mind Germany represented power, France wealth. By allying herself with both, Russia would benefit by the strength of the one and the financial resources of the other. When, therefore, he received a telegram from the Kaiser inviting him to stop at Rominten on his way back to Russia, he thought the opportunity had come for furthering these closer relations.<sup>52</sup> The quasi-royal fashion in which the Kaiser received him at Rominten on September 26 gratified Witte further. He was soon informed by his host of the fact that a treaty had been signed at Björkö, providing for a defensive alliance, to which France was to be invited to become a member. But he was not shown the text of the treaty and did not grasp its real intent. Supposing that the Kaiser intended a defensive alliance, into which Germany, Russia, and France should enter voluntarily and as equals, he congratulated the Kaiser on his plan, but pointed out that since its success depended on securing the adhesion of France, France must no longer be exasperated in the Moroccan negotiations. The Kaiser agreed and telegraphed on the spot to Prince von Bülow to withdraw the demand that the frontier between Algiers and Morocco should be one of the questions which must be discussed at the conference of Algeciras. In passing through Paris, on his return from Portsmouth, M. Witte had learned that the refusal of the French to submit this question for discussion by the Powers had caused great irritation and brought a deadlock in the Moroccan negotiations. It was thus, as a result of the Rominten interview, that two days later it was possible at Paris to sign the

<sup>51</sup> *WNC.*, pp. 130-132.

<sup>52</sup> The Kaiser's pretext for inviting him to an interview was to decorate him on account of the coming into effect of the treaty of commerce which Witte had negotiated with von Bülow the preceding year. The Kaiser had previously asked (September 17) and secured (September 24) the Tsar's consent to tell Witte of the Björkö Treaty. *WNC.*, pp. 126-127.



Franco-German accord of September 28 by which all the questions to be discussed at the conference of Algéciras were finally settled.<sup>53</sup>

When, however, M. Witte arrived in Russia from Rominten, was shown the text of the Björkö Treaty, and confronted with the arguments of Count Lamsdorf against it, he also saw the necessity for its annulment. In the midst of the revolutionary fermentation which resulted in the Tsar's famous constitutional manifesto of October 30, Count Witte<sup>54</sup> wrote a letter to Berlin in which he argued against the validity of the Björkö Treaty on the ground that it lacked the signature of the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs; he also pointed out that a sovereign is too insufficiently informed on foreign affairs to act without the advice of his responsible minister. Prince von Bülow replied that he was not aware that such ministerial responsibility existed in Russia and repeated his master's words, "What is signed is signed".<sup>55</sup>

Not to be thus checked, Count Witte, acting in concert with Count Lamsdorf, adopted a more effective procedure. A letter was drawn up for Nicholas II. to send to the Kaiser, explaining to him why it was impossible for Russia to give effect to the treaty; it suggested in place of the treaty a declaration of friendly assurances.<sup>56</sup> But this letter, instead of being sent by the personal military attaché of one of the emperors, was forwarded in the regular diplomatic way to the Russian embassy in Berlin. It was accompanied by a letter of instructions from Count Lamsdorf to Count Osten-Sacken, directing him to repeat to the German government the declaration in the Tsar's personal letter to the Kaiser.<sup>57</sup> The unmistakable clearness of the language in these communications had its effect in Berlin, and the Tsar was thus liberated from the engagements which he had so inconsiderately entered into at Björkö.<sup>58</sup>

SIDNEY B. FAY.

<sup>53</sup> Tardieu, *Conférence d'Algéciras*, pp. 484-486; Bompard, pp. 434-440; cf. also *WNC.*, p. 131, in which the Kaiser says, "Our Moroccan business is regulated to entire satisfaction".

<sup>54</sup> He had been created count as a reward for his services in the peace negotiations at Portsmouth.

<sup>55</sup> Bompard, pp. 440-444.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Willy to Nicky, November 26, 1905. *WNC.*, p. 142: "Thanks for letter. Shall reply after hearing Chancellor." Cf. Bompard, pp. 444-445.

<sup>57</sup> Bompard, pp. 445-446, who quotes an important conversation of December 1, 1905, with Count Witte.

<sup>58</sup> From the middle of December, 1905, the Willy-Nicky correspondence cooled into relatively infrequent and unimportant messages of politeness. Germany again took up the Morocco affair and confronted France at Algéciras with a new series of difficulties, until it finally became clear that Germany had lost the support of the delegates of all the powers except the Sultan of Morocco and "his brilliant second", Austria.

## NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

### CURRENT LAWFUL MONEY OF NEW ENGLAND

THE term "Current Lawful Money of New England" is frequently found in laws, bonds, inventories, and accounts, written either in full or in such abbreviated forms as "Lawful Money" and "L. M.", and its meaning is clearly not the same in all cases. Before attempting to find out what it meant in New England we shall need to review briefly the currency situation in the colonies.

With the exception of Massachusetts, the colonies had no coins of their own and were dependent for specie or hard money on foreign gold and silver. As trade expanded and the number of these coins increased, the colonists were obliged to decide, in terms of English money, the rate at which such coins should circulate. At first the crown authorized the colonial governors to fix the rate by local proclamation, but as silver was always scarce, partly because of the comparatively small amount in circulation and partly because colonial merchants found it more profitable to pay their British debt balances in that medium, some of the colonies abused the privilege by attempting to regulate the value of foreign coins in such a way as to draw hard money from other colonies into their own. This they did by offering to accept pieces of eight, Spanish dollars, and other coins at rates higher than those established by their neighbors.

Complaints inevitably arose. In 1702 Governor Blakiston of Maryland sent to England a protest against the Pennsylvania money act of 1700, which so raised the value of a dollar that a coin of standard weight—seventeen and a half pennyweight—would pass for nearly eight shillings, a valuation which probably had been current in the colony for some time. In view of this money rivalry and its injury to colonial trade, the authorities in England decided to withdraw the privilege of determining rates by local proclamation, and to create a single standard by fiat of the crown.

The matter was brought before the Board of Trade in 1703, and many persons familiar with colonial affairs were called in for information and advice. When it was found that Massachusetts by her act of 1697—an act that had been confirmed by the crown and could not be altered, as was not the case with the Pennsylvania act

of 1700—had fixed the value of the Spanish dollar at six shillings,<sup>1</sup> the Board agreed to recommend that this rate be extended to all the colonies. Consequently, by the proclamation of 1704, the Spanish dollar (and other coins in proportion) was made current in the colonies at six shillings by tale (or six shillings and eightpence an ounce by weight, though this fact is not stated in the proclamation), a valuation which represented a depreciation of thirty-three and a third per cent. from that of the same coin in England, where the sterling value was four shillings and sixpence to the dollar and five shillings and twopence to the ounce. Hence arose “proclamation money”, which was foreign silver and foreign silver only. The failure of the colonists in the next few years to obey the proclamation led to the passage by Parliament of the coinage act of 1708, which fixed the same rate by statute.

But as the colonies continued to suffer from a scarcity of hard money and in certain cases endeavored to better their condition by making advantageous offers for the silver that they wanted, there came into existence the various forms of “colonial currency”, which was not money at all, but only a method of reckoning values, a statement of the amount in shillings at which a Spanish dollar would be accepted in a given colony. These amounts ran from eight shillings in New York and North Carolina to seven shillings and sixpence in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland, and to six shillings, or the proclamation rate, in New England and Virginia. These amounts varied at different times and were always liable to alteration, but before 1750 they had become fairly stable, and the nearer they approached the proclamation rate, which was the legal standard, the higher their repute.

Thus the colonies in the eighteenth century had to reckon with three valuations of foreign coins in all their business transactions: *sterling*, with silver at five shillings or more accurately five shillings and twopence an ounce<sup>2</sup> and four shillings and sixpence to the dol-

<sup>1</sup> This rate was based on the actual value of the pine-tree shilling, which was ninepence sterling. In thus depreciating the value of her coinage, Massachusetts evidently desired to prevent the coins from leaving the colony. The rating of a full-weight Spanish dollar at six pine-tree shillings, or four and sixpence sterling, was adopted by Massachusetts as early as 1672 and by Connecticut a few years later.

<sup>2</sup> Five shillings and twopence was the British government standard for an ounce of silver, and was nearly twopence better than the Spanish standard. The price of silver was always fluctuating in the London market, partly because of scarcity, as when the government cornered the supply, and partly because of the demands of the manufacturers of plate. At times the price rose as high as nearly six shillings. The price in the colonies rose to more than sixty shillings in paper before 1750.

lar; *proclamation money*, in which an ounce of silver was valued at six shillings and eightpence or more accurately six shillings tenpence and a half and a dollar at six shillings; and *currency* or reckoning money, which rated an ounce of silver from seven to eight shillings and a dollar from six to eight shillings. When making payments in England by means of bills of exchange, it was always necessary to add to the sterling rate the difference of exchange, which varied from year to year and from month to month, running from twenty-five to sixty per cent. in Virginia and from thirty-three and a third to eighty per cent. and more in New York. By the act of 1750 in Massachusetts, the exchange was fixed at  $133\frac{1}{3}$  local currency to 100 sterling, which was the proclamation rate. Virginia's normal rate of 125 to 100 was better than proclamation, while that of South Carolina, which was sometimes more than 700 to 100, was the worst in the colonies.

The scarcity of coin for purposes of government and trade and for meeting certain unusual expenditures, generally of a military nature, led to the issue of paper money or bills of credit. Depreciation followed sooner or later, as the issues grew larger and funding conditions and periods of redemption became less satisfactory, until before the middle of the century in New England the bills were at eleven to one in Massachusetts, twenty to one in New Hampshire, twenty-three to one in Rhode Island, and nine to one in Connecticut. The situation became so serious that in 1750 Massachusetts, taking advantage of the receipt of a large amount of silver and copper coin from England, appropriated by Parliament to recompense the colony for the share which it had taken in the Louisburg expedition, returned to a specie basis and forbade the circulation in the colony of the bills of her neighbors, which had hitherto passed promiscuously and without discount throughout New England.

Now "lawful money" had to be one or other of these varieties, either sterling, proclamation, currency, or paper. Sterling it could not be, for no statute had made sterling a lawful medium for all America, but proclamation it clearly was, for that had been made the legal tender of the colonies by the act of 1708. At the same time both currency and paper were based upon law, the law of the colonies, and it is quite possible that when the term "lawful money" is used in New England, the reference is to either currency or paper. Light upon the matter is thrown by a case, that of *Dering versus Packer*, which was carried on appeal to England in 1760 and, like the famous *McSparran* case in Rhode Island which turned on the meaning of the word "orthodox", depended for decision on what was meant by the phrase "current lawful money of New England".

In 1734 Thomas Packer of Portsmouth, sheriff of New Hampshire, became indebted to his brother-in-law Henry Dering, a merchant of Boston, in the sum of £2460, "current lawful money of New England or good public bills of credit of Massachusetts", as stated in the bond drawn up on January 30, 1735. Some payments were made, but in 1750, when Dering died, Packer still owed £2123. Thomas Dering, Henry's son, was made executor of the estate and when Packer tendered in payment "a parcel of bills", containing £2000 of New Hampshire, old tenor, and £200 of Connecticut, old tenor, he refused to receive them, unless allowance were made for depreciation. Packer declined to pay in any other medium and Dering sued him in the New Hampshire inferior court of common pleas. The jury found for Dering to the full value of the bond—principal, interest, and double penalty—amounting to £4920 or £3690 sterling. Packer moved to be heard by the court sitting in equity and won his case. Dering carried his suit to the superior court and again got a favorable verdict, but when Packer again obtained a review in chancery the former equity judgment was sustained. Dering then appealed to England.

The point at issue was this. Dering claimed that the debt should be paid either in Massachusetts bills of credit, which after 1750 were as good as specie, and so worth more than those of any of the other New England colonies, or in silver, that is, Massachusetts pine-tree shillings, which were still in circulation, or foreign silver at proclamation rates. Packer, on the other hand, claimed that the debt could be paid in what was commonly understood to be lawful money in 1735, bills of credit of any of the New England colonies, which were at that time interchangeable without discount. Old tenor bills of New Hampshire and Connecticut were not legal tender in private transactions and could not be made so, since that would be contrary to a law of England, the act of 1708, but they were lawful money when passed by agreement or when specially provided for in the contract. Packer did not deny that these bills had greatly depreciated, but he rested his case upon a strict interpretation of the letter of the bond. Should Dering win on appeal, he would obtain the full value of the bond with penalty; but should he lose he would have to accept depreciated paper, which according to his own calculation would amount to £790 instead of £3690 sterling, or about one-fifth of the value of the debt.<sup>3</sup>

The decision of the Privy Council is both interesting and important. It reversed the equity judgment of the superior court of

<sup>3</sup> The briefs in the case are in the British Museum, Add. MSS. 36218, ff. 44-48. Transcripts are in the Library of Congress.

New Hampshire and ordered Packer to pay the debt in silver, at the rate of thirty-seven shillings, old tenor, to an ounce, including principal, interest to the time of payment, and costs.<sup>4</sup> It thus declared that the only "lawful money" in New England was silver. When the decision became known in New England it aroused considerable dissent. Jared Ingersoll, in commenting on the case,<sup>5</sup> said, "Perhaps they were mistaken in that matter, not being acquainted with the currency and understanding of the people in New England and the defendant not well prepared to shew that matter".

What Ingersoll meant was that "lawful money" in New England, according to the customary use of the term, was paper, but whether paper at par, paper as it was valued when the debt was incurred, or paper as valued when the bond was given, he does not say. On this problem Dr. Ezra Stiles in his *Itineraries* throws light which may be deemed for the moment conclusive. He gives several illustrations of the corresponding values of sterling, proclamation, and lawful money, and makes it clear that the last named in New England was anything, whether silver or paper, which passed at the proclamation rate, that is, six shillings to the dollar. The old tenor bills of Connecticut and Rhode Island bore on their face the phrase "of Value equal to Money", that is, specie,<sup>6</sup> and these bills are probably what Ingersoll had in mind. We may conclude, therefore, that "current lawful money of New England" might be either Massachusetts shillings, foreign silver at proclamation rates, or bills of credit at their face value, but that the latter was the commonly accepted meaning of the term among the New England colonists.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

<sup>4</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial*, vol. IV., § 407.

<sup>5</sup> "Notes of Decision of Case, *Dering vs. Packer*", is among the Ingersoll Papers in the possession of the New Haven Colony Historical Society, and is printed with other selections from these papers, edited by Professor Dexter, in volume IX. of the publications of that society, pp. 239-242. Ingersoll's comment is on page 240.

<sup>6</sup> When the term "money" or "real money" was used it always meant silver or gold, though very little gold was actually in circulation in New England. The chief hard money there was silver and copper.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*Norman Institutions.* By CHARLES HOMER HASKINS, Gurney Professor of History and Political Science in Harvard University. [Harvard Historical Studies, vol. XXIV.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1918. Pp. xv, 377, plates 7. \$2.75.)

*Les Études de M. Haskins sur les Institutions Normandes de Guillaume le Conquérant au XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle.* Par JEAN LESQUIER. [Extrait du *Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie*, t. XXXII.] (Caen: Henri Delesques. 1918. Pp. 61-241.)

PROFESSOR HASKINS's long-expected book is very welcome. Of the six chapters all but one, Normandy under Robert Curthose and William Rufus, have appeared in earlier form in this *Review* or in the *English Historical Review*. Most of the appendixes, which fill more than one-third of the book, are new, and the chapters have been thoroughly revised and made more complete. As is well known, Professor Haskins deals with the institutional history of Normandy from William the Conqueror through the reforms of Henry II. and with the materials for that history. The first three appendixes, two of them new, treat of materials for still earlier Norman history.

Logically the study of the material comes first. On its collection and preparation depends our ability to reconstruct the past. This portion of his task is the strongest part of Professor Haskins's work. In three essential particulars it is worthy of the highest praise: first, in completeness, the book leaves us with the conviction that every known source of material has been thoroughly explored and that, barring the discovery of some now unknown depository, nothing remains to modify the conclusions which we can reach from the scanty materials left us; secondly, in the carefulness and accuracy with which the texts have been prepared, manifest not merely in many convincing rectifications of already published documents but also in the editing of numerous unpublished texts which can be tested for accuracy from seven photographic plates; and thirdly, in the wide variety of illustrative matter drawn upon for comment. It is with regret that one concludes from the appendixes that the idea of Norman *Regesta* from William I. to the accession of Henry II. has been given up. From the diplomatic point of view, Professor Haskins's editing is so superior in technique and accuracy to anything heretofore done in English, so fully on a par with the best work of French scholars, that this decision must be deplored.



On the side of historical result, there are three problems which it was hoped this investigation would go far to solve: the relation of the distinctive Anglo-Norman judicial institutions to those of the later Frankish empire; the relation of the reforms of Henry II. to those of his grandfather, Henry I.; and the priority in time of England or Normandy in the judicial changes. Some light has been thrown on the first two of these questions, tending to show more clearly the connection which has generally been supposed to exist, but it is only the third that has been really solved. Professor Haskins's proof that the new judicial institutions and the new procedure go back in Normandy into the time of Henry's father is as near a demonstration as is possible in history, and, unless some unknown evidence is discovered, the priority of Normandy must be conceded. While this is the largest historical result that has been reached, there are a great many smaller matters of which our knowledge has been increased, or made more definite than before: early feudal arrangements in Normandy; the power of the Norman duke; the Norman side of the institutions transferred to England; the character of the government of Robert Curthose; details of the operation of assizes, jury, and exchequer; and numerous rectifications in fact and chronology, as well as in texts. If the sum total is felt by anyone to be disappointing, it is clear that the scantiness of our material is responsible.

Slips of any kind are rare. Valin on page 266 of his *Duc de Normandie* ascribes his document no. XI. not to Henry alone (p. 221) but to Geoffrey or Henry. The effect of Henry's legislation in 1159 seems carried a bit too far (p. 220), and the meaning "legislative enactment" for "assize" not quite strongly enough emphasized (p. 212), for that usage was general in Europe, and the genealogical descent of that line of meaning (p. 211) can be carried back to the judicial "assessors" of the later empire. The difficulty of distinguishing between witness-proof and recognition is not too strongly insisted upon; "verdict" was not used, I think, for the declaration in witness-proof, and verdict and declaration stood in quite different relations to the judgment made by the court; but it is just as necessary to distinguish between witness-proof and the use of witnesses to inform the jury or themselves to make a part of the jury, these last being steps in the new procedure towards the modern use of evidence. The transition from the old to the new procedure has never yet been thoroughly studied, and the confusion which seems to reign in the facts is not a little discouraging.

M. Lesquier's little book is not a translation of Mr. Haskins's, though occasional passages are translated, nor is it a critical commentary upon it, the compiler nowhere, so far as I have discovered, expressing his own opinion, but it is a quite full abstract of those portions of the book which especially concern Norman history. The manuscript was evidently prepared originally from the papers as they appeared in the *American* and *English Historical Reviews*, but it has had the advantage of the revisions made in the book, of which full use appears to have been made, the chap-

ter on Normandy under Robert Curthose and William Rufus being included, though not all the appendixes germane to the subject are abstracted. So far as tested the abstract seems to have been faithfully constructed both as regards text and notes, which are very fully given with all essential references. While published no doubt particularly for the benefit of those who are interested in the history of the Norman duchy, such a condensation, independent in phrasing, with varying emphasis and slightly different point of view, may be found useful by others.

G. B. ADAMS.

*Studies in English Franciscan History.* By A. G. LITTLE, M.A.  
(New York and London: Longmans, Green, and Company.  
1917. Pp. ix, 248. \$3.00.)

It is nearly twenty-seven years since Mr. Little wrote *The Grey Friars in Oxford*, a book which remains, perhaps, the most valuable of all the publications issued by the Oxford Historical Society. The patient labor, seasoned scholarship, and rare historical insight that have characterized Mr. Little's subsequent works on the history of the early English Franciscans, notably his critical edition of Eccleston's *De Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam*—these qualities are still more conspicuous in the present studies, which comprise the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in 1916. In these six lectures Mr. Little deals with the Franciscan Observance of the Vow of Poverty; the Failure of Mendicancy; the Relation of the Friars to the Monks and Parish Priests; Popular Preaching; the Influence of the Franciscans in the Education of the Clergy; and the Franciscan School at Oxford.

On all these subjects Mr. Little throws much new light. In the lecture on the education of the clergy, we learn a great deal about Friar John of Wales, who has scarcely received his due meed of recognition in modern times. This remarkable Welshman, who died about 1285, was honored by the title of "Arbor Vitae", and his "Manuals" for the instruction of priests, teachers, and preachers long enjoyed a wide-spread popularity. The lecture on the methods and matter of the early Franciscan preachers, with its wealth of enlivening anecdotes, is also full of interest even for those who are not especially students of Franciscan history. Not the least valuable feature of this lecture is the prominence given to certain different collections of material for preachers compiled by English Franciscans, such as the *Fasciculus Morum*, which has not yet been edited.

Mr. Little takes occasion to correct the erroneous statement of Green that the friars usually settled in "low, swampy and undrained spots in the large towns". Although many of their sites were decidedly undesirable, yet so far from being opposed to hygiene, Mr. Little shows that the efforts of the friars to improve the general sanitary conditions and to obtain a good water supply for their neighbors as well as for themselves, were of great advantage to the crowded towns.

Doubtless the immense popularity attained by the Franciscans was their greatest danger in respect to their observance of poverty, and their decline, toward the close of the thirteenth century, was mainly due, in Mr. Little's opinion, to their building of large churches and convents and to their employment in considerable numbers in important offices, unsuitable to their calling. But, if a study of the history of the Franciscans leaves a feeling of disappointment, "this is partly due", Mr. Little declares, "not only to the beauty and nobility of their ideal, but also to the greatness of their achievements at certain times".

Some words of Mr. Little on the subject of medieval study are also worthy of remark:

Most of us who are students of the Middle Ages [he says] confine ourselves perhaps too much to chronicles and records; we do not read enough of the books which the educated men of the Middle Ages read, nor of the books which they wrote. A study of this kind may be useful in helping us to see something of the ways in which the medieval mind worked, and something of the materials on which it worked.

This, surely, is well and wisely said, and it is precisely because Mr. Little is so thoroughly familiar with the books which were written and read in the Middle Ages, as well as with the chronicles and records of the period, that his *Studies in English Franciscan History* forms so important a contribution to the history of religious life and thought in medieval England. The book is provided with a very good index and with a useful appendix.

PASCHAL ROBINSON.

*Finance and Trade under Edward III.* By Members of the History School; edited by GEORGE UNWIN. [Publications of the University of Manchester, Historical Series, no. XXXII.] (Manchester: University Press; London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1918. Pp. xxx, 360. 15 sh.)

A COLLECTION of essays on medieval English economic life is something of a rarity and deserves a welcome in accordance with its worth and interest. Professor Unwin has shown himself to be a brilliant and scholarly interpreter of economic history in previous works and articles and in bringing out the present volume he adds to his laurels. In dealing with fourteenth-century conditions the authors of the articles in this volume throw much valuable light on a period of English history which is just beginning to be properly understood and interpreted by historians. The social and economic aspects of the reigns of Edward III. and Richard II. have been receiving much attention from English, French, and American scholars of late years, and the studies contained in this volume form a welcome addition to the secondary material already available in this field.

In his preface Professor Unwin tells us that the present volume of  
AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIV.—6.

essays is really an installment of a larger projected work, on a dozen or more different aspects of fourteenth-century history, by graduates of the history school of Manchester University and that, apart from his own contributions, the essays here presented are based on theses prepared for the history schools of 1911 and 1912. All but one of the contributors were members of the honor classes conducted by Professors Tout and Unwin, and their work has therefore been carefully supervised and edited.

The introduction by Professor Unwin covers fifteen pages and is an able analysis of Edward III.'s economic attitude. It is based largely on a criticism of Dr. Cunningham's earlier statements in his *Growth of English Industry and Commerce* attributing to Edward III. definite economic policies aiming "at the development of the national resources and increase of the national power". Professor Unwin attempts to show "that there is little ground for attributing any definite economic policy to Edward III. except the one implied in the judgment of Stubbs, 'Like Richard I. he valued England primarily as a source of supplies'", and that, "If a distinctive policy is to be associated with the reign it must be attributed to the action of Parliament". The introduction as a whole is a valuable commentary on royal opportunism and a needed antidote to notions of broad statesmanship and patriotism in connection with a king whom Professor Tout has characterized as lacking in "definite policy and clear ideals" and Bishop Stubbs calls "unscrupulous, selfish, extravagant, and ostentatious".

The opening essay, entitled "Social Evolution in Mediaeval London", was delivered by Professor Unwin as the Warburton Lecture of 1911 and evidently retains its original form. It is really a popular article on London social and economic life in the thirteenth century and later, without foot-notes or bibliography. Anyone at all interested in English social history will enjoy reading it but its connection with finance and trade under Edward III. is somewhat remote and its omission from the present volume would not have been a serious one. Much the same might be said of the second essay by the editor, "London Tradesmen and their Creditors", which, though fortified by foot-notes, is entirely devoted to late thirteenth-century finance. Both these essays are well worthy of publication as literary historical studies of popular type, such as Green, Froude, and Jessopp delighted in, but their inclusion in a collection of special studies on the reign of Edward III. is questionable.

The third essay is by Miss Margaret Curtis and deals with "The London Lay Subsidy of 1332" under three headings, the tax and its assessment, the size, wealth, and occupations of the population, and the wealth and trades of the wards. There are also two brief appendixes and three notes with original material in the shape of the account of the collectors of the subsidy, which covers thirty pages of names with assessments. This essay is interesting and scholarly though possibly over factual and descriptive. Miss Curtis refers frequently to the valuable

articles on taxation by Professor Willard of Colorado though unable to make use of his note on the taxes upon movables of the reign of Edward III. which appeared recently in the *English Historical Review*.

The next contribution is an essay on "The Societies of the Bardi and the Peruzzi and their dealings with Edward III., 1327-1345", by Mr. Ephraim Russell. It throws valuable light on the foreign financial relations of all three Edwards, who borrowed nearly half a million pounds from the Italian bankers between 1290 and 1345. Only a small part of these loans was ever repaid by Edward III. and the Bardi and Peruzzi failed disastrously in 1345, as the Riccardi and Frescobaldi had failed under his predecessors. The appendix to this essay gives lists of the Bardi and Peruzzi societies in England.

In "The Taxation of Wool, 1327-1348", Mr. F. R. Barnes makes an important special contribution to English economic history. He writes a clear and forcible essay with more breadth of view and more generalizations than some of the other contributors to the volume. The importance of control by the Commons of indirect as well as of direct forms of taxation and the check administered to the royal power are well brought out and emphasized, while much light is thrown on the financial history of the first twenty years of Edward III.'s reign. Somewhat closely connected with this essay is Professor Unwin's own scholarly contribution on "The Estate of Merchants, 1336-1365", which fills the next seventy-five pages. It is organized by periods and presents a most valuable survey of the character and activities of the merchant estate under Edward III. Space forbids any detailed analysis of this essay which is a distinct contribution to the social and economic history of the fourteenth century and a credit to Professor Unwin.

The last two essays in the volume are special studies of English economic and foreign policy. The first, by Mr. Frank Sargeant, deals with the "Wine Trade with Gascony" in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the second, by Miss Dorothy Greaves, with "Calais under Edward III." Both of these essays add something to our knowledge of medieval England and show the importance of her Continental affiliations and policies. A list of Calais officials is appended to Miss Greaves's essay.

There is a good general index covering all the essays, and the typography and general make-up of the volume are worthy of the Manchester University Press, while the proof-reading appears to have been carefully done.

N. M. TRENHOLME.

*The Rise of the Spanish Empire in the Old World and in the New.*

By ROGER BIGELOW MERRIMAN. In two volumes. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1918. Pp. xxviii, 529; xv, 387. \$7.50.)

AN AMERICAN book in the field cultivated by Prescott, Ticknor, and Lea is likely to be measured by the high standard which those writers

set, and allowance will not always be made for the difficulty of the subject. The rise of the Spanish Empire is a difficult subject; it calls for a clear narrative of a vast mass of complicated facts extending over a long period, and analysis and description of a body of diverse institutions, and a statement of the social and economic basis on which the empire was built. There is no doubt, as Professor Merriman says, that one must seek the origins of the Spanish Empire in the early history of the Peninsula, but, when he contrasts it with the rise of the British Empire, one may well question his affirmation that "it is possible to make an intelligent study of the British Empire without going back of the sixteenth century" (I. 3); for the spirit that determined the character of the British Empire, the spirit of liberty, had its origin surely prior to the sixteenth century, and no study of the British Empire can be intelligent that does not consider the origin and development of this spirit, the very soul of the empire.

The story to be told in the first volume of this work is the story of the various streams of provincial and national life that were brought together, and in their union formed the beginning of the Spanish Empire; it recounts the Christian advance at the expense of the Moors, the rise of Castile, the beginning of the conquest of the Canary Islands, the institutions of medieval Castile, the development of Aragon and Catalonia, their conquests in the Mediterranean, and the institutions of these eastern kingdoms. It was reasonable to expect, since the Spanish Empire "has its origins in the earliest periods of antiquity" (I. 3), that somewhere in the early chapters there would be offered an exposition of what Moorish civilization achieved and left as the basis of the Christian society that followed. One is disappointed in not finding this expectation met; for dynastic changes and lines of Saracenic rulers, however fully set forth, do not adequately reveal this basis. In some instances many of the uncharacterized names given might have been advantageously suppressed in favor of more enlightening general statements. In this part, where there was need of a lucid narrative to present the successive events in the life of a province or of a kingdom, the work has the correct uniformity of a well-composed chronicle; many sections have evidently been written with the open *Crónica* by the side of the author's manuscript, and features of the chronicle's style have unconsciously been transferred to the written page. Thus the narrative that should display the historical events in the relation of their real significance is less successful than the author's analysis of institutions; in fact, the parts of the first volume that deal with the early institutions of the Christians in the Peninsula are excellent. Chapters IV., V., and XI. constitute a noteworthy contribution to the literature in English on early Spain. Yet as the work now stands we have a first volume of 529 pages that may be considered as an introduction to the 350 pages of text, in the second volume.

From the dull chronicle that constitutes a considerable part of the first volume, one turns with satisfaction to the vigorous pages of the



second volume. Here the writer frees himself from his struggle with medieval centuries, and shakes off what apparently to him is the incubus of chronology. In these 350 pages he presents a profoundly interesting disquisition on the reign of the Catholic kings, treating it as a cross-section of the history of Spain. In a book covering a period of a thousand years, the writer is bound to be especially interested in some part of his extensive subject, and especially fitted by nature or his attainments to treat that part successfully, or more successfully than the rest of it. But the other parts have to be written, because the plan of the book demands it. In opening the second volume of this work, the reader feels at once that he has before him the subject on account of which the book was written. Some of the subdivisions of this subject are the union of Aragon and Castile, the overthrow of the rebels of Catalonia, the conquest of Granada, absolutism and the struggle for unity of faith and race, the internal reorganization in all its phases, the final conquest and organization of the Canaries, the discovery of America and the preliminary steps in the organization of the colonial system, the proposed expansion through marriage alliances, Ferdinand's struggle against fate, and the enlarging shadow of the Hapsburg peril. The treatment which these topics in their historical setting receive is strong, scholarly, and enlightening; through it all one sees the growing figure of Ferdinand, and one is led almost unconsciously to accept the author's conclusion that it is an heroic figure. This presentation is a timely and well-administered antidote to the sentimental exaltation of the Isabella of tradition.

The style, particularly of the first volume, sometimes becomes difficult by reason of the author's reluctance to repeat his substantive, and the consequent lack of immediate clearness through the injudicious use of pronouns and the frequent employment of "the former" and "the latter", when some other form of expression might have been used with greater advantage. It is, moreover, to be regretted that the occasion of writing this book was not seized to inaugurate a reasonable practice in the writing of Spanish names in English texts. This is not the case of a single sinner; but some of the sinners by their prestige have caused their shortcomings to be tolerated and even to be consciously imitated. After Prescott one may perhaps hesitate to write Fernando, still if "Ferdinand" and "Henry" and "John" are found acceptable by our author, it is not quite clear why he should discriminate against Peter, and let him stand as "Pedro". An attempt to translate Spanish names into their alleged English equivalents inevitably produces an ugly confusion in the text, since many names will be found that do not admit of such translation. And this confusion necessarily appears exaggerated when a book is written, as this one is, very largely from the viewpoint of persons. A determination to write the names of Spanish persons as the Spaniards wrote them would lead to a decided improvement in our pages.

BERNARD MOSES.



*Protestantism in Germany.* By KERR D. MACMILLAN, President of Wells College. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1917. Pp. viii, 282. \$1.50.)

THIS volume is in spirit and in effect a "war book". Although the author expressly disclaims any intention to give an adequate explanation of "the phenomena of present-day German life", still his work is guided throughout by an obvious purpose to make it at least a contribution to such an explanation. There are two main theses developed in the historical survey which forms the principal part of the book: first, that Luther's personal conception of a new church order was essentially and fundamentally congregational, and second, that this primitive ideal was crowded out by forces over which Luther and later men of similar tendencies had no control.

To establish his first point the author employs the inevitable method of citing illustrations from Luther's own utterances. It is a method superficially convincing, but, especially in the case of Luther, pretty certain to be misleading. Of all leaders of men he was the least consistent in his words and in his actions. Dr. Macmillan is quite alive to this and explains it sufficiently by remarking that all of Luther's writings are "occasional". He gathers much evidence to show that the reformer's real inclination would have been toward the right of every Christian community to govern itself, and we may safely go as far as this: that if he had been living in an ideal world, in which every Christian man corresponded to his ideal description of him, this would have been a safe working principle. But it is evident that, even as early as 1520, he had come to see that the world must be taken as it was, and even though the Christian man, enslaved in a Babylonian Captivity, was free by his essential Christian quality, still the chief agency to deliver him was, so far as Germany was concerned, the Order of the Princes. That is the meaning of the great Lutheran trilogy of 1520. Thus far we can readily go, but when Dr. Macmillan pushes his thesis beyond this point he seems to weaken it the more, the further he goes.

The treatment of the second point is more convincing. Chapters III. to VI. follow in chronological order the various stages by which the control of the German states over both the inward and the outward life of the church was fastened upon the country. Naturally the central feature of this description is found in the policy of Prussia under Hohenzollern leadership. The curious blending of religious indifferentism, as in the case of Frederick II., or of religious bigotry as personified in Frederick William III., with a determined enforcement of state control is well brought out. The two concluding chapters are devoted to a study of the effects of this state control upon the church and the society it aimed to serve. The twin evils of officialism and patronage, partly offset by the purifying influences of both Pietism and Rationalism, are described in chapter VII., and the final chapter is devoted to a survey of the effort of the state to present to the people the idea of a "Ger-

man God" as "the logical outcome of a century of German theological thought".

There are throughout the volume evidences of careless editing, as, for example, "Brandburg", "Leipsig", "Orlamund", a reference to the Council of Homberg without previous mention by name, frequent omission of the conjunction "that". The absence of a bibliography is regrettable.

*The Expansion of Europe, 1415-1789: a History of the Foundations of the Modern World.* By WILBUR CORTEZ ABBOTT, B.Litt. (Oxon.), M.A., Professor of History in Yale University. In two volumes. [American Historical Series, under the editorship of Charles H. Haskins.] (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1918. Pp. xiii, 512; xiii, 463. \$6.50.)

A THREEFOLD idea is involved in the preparation of this work. Its purpose is to describe: first, the rise of the European state-system and of European civilization out of the conditions characteristic of the later Middle Ages; secondly, the more or less coincident spread of European colonization; and thirdly, the reaction of the latter process on "affairs and ideas" in Europe itself. These three phases of development, viewed in their essential interrelationship, are made to furnish the "foundations of the modern world".

After sketching the situation in Europe during the later Middle Ages, Professor Abbott discusses the beginnings of "intellectual expansion" in the "Renaissance", of "territorial expansion" in the "age of discovery", and of "modern politics" in the "rise of national kingdoms". This he follows by chapters devoted to the conventional type of political history, broadened out so as to include lands and peoples ordinarily omitted from due consideration, and interspersed with accounts of the activities of Europeans oversea, and—in the case of the Russians—overland. At intervals of half a century, also, he examines the various aspects of social, economic, and intellectual progress observable during the period immediately preceding.

Within the dates given, the work constitutes what is probably the best general history of European civilization available in English. It reveals an abundance of reading and research, a symmetry in composition remarkable for the deftness with which the several features are interwoven, and a talent for effective and pleasing expression. Many of the maps and illustrations, also, are novel and interesting.

For the courage with which the author has ventured to declare what the subject-matter of modern European history ought to be, and for the cogency and vigor with which, in preface, introduction, and text, he sustains his opinion, he merits hearty commendation. While putting forth an ambitious effort in constructive scholarship, he has thrown down a challenge to routine methods of presentation. And yet, with

all due recognition of their merits, it is to be regretted that Professor Abbott had the volumes issued as text-books. In form, content, and style they appeal more to the general reader of educated tastes than to the college student. They will be difficult to fit into the existing curriculum. It may be doubted, indeed, whether the average college teacher of history is sufficiently well versed in the subject, as here conceived and treated, to be able to use the books to advantage in the classroom. Their utility for reference, however, is unquestionable.

Apart from the pedagogical phase of the matter, several characteristics of the work detract from its worth. The main title is misleading, for it does not suggest the "self-enlargement" of Europe in civilization, which is the principal theme, but the deeds of Europeans in the world beyond. Even the subtitle might be criticized for the implications it raises as to the chronological determination of both the "modern world" and its "foundations". Given the almost encyclopaedic nature of the work, one is tempted to ask why many things belonging in all propriety to the "expansion" of Europe, alike in concept and in statement of fact, were omitted.

Even granting the appropriateness of the term "expansion" as applied to the "self-enlargement" of Europe in civilization, it is hardly comprehensive enough when made to include European colonization, unless a concrete account is supplied of the interaction of that civilization and its oversea environment. Conversely, the reaction of colonization on Europe itself would seem to call for an equally full description of the interaction of exotic influences and their European environment. Instead of handling the subject in this way, Professor Abbott resorts to generalizations that are often rhetorical rather than convincing or even intelligible. Specific evidence for his assertions in this field he rarely presents. He follows much the same procedure, also, when trying to show the existence of a vital relationship between colonial activities and contemporaneous happenings in Europe itself, although the association may be one merely of coincidence in point of time.

To a like category of vagueness may be assigned the occasional uncertainty in the reader's mind as to the particular century of which the author is writing. The "end of the Middle Ages" and the "beginnings of modern Europe" are made to range anywhere from the thirteenth century to the early seventeenth. So, too, the choice of a specific date or epoch as a starting-point, when much of the subject-matter that follows deals with conditions long precedent to it, is disconcerting. Nor does it seem desirable in the interest of clearness to insert the names of obscure individuals with little or no explanation of their presence. Errors, finally, are rather numerous, especially in connection with the account of Spanish America. Few are so conspicuous as that of associating the "cinquecento" with the fifteenth century (I. 49), but they are frequent enough to warrant their removal from a future edition.

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

*A History of the British Army.* By the Hon. J. W. FORTESCUE. Volume VIII., 1811-1812. *Maps and Plans illustrating Fortescue's History of the British Army, Volume VIII.* (London: Macmillan and Company. 1917. Pp. xxiii, 687; iv, 23 maps. 30 sh.)

THE high standard of excellence of the preceding volumes of this valuable and comprehensive work is well sustained in this one, which with the exception of two chapters, one of sixty-six pages on the foreign policy of Great Britain under the direction of Wellesley and Castlereagh, and another, of little more than half that length, relating the principal military events of the first six months of the war with the United States, deals entirely with the operations of the British forces in Portugal and Spain in 1811 and 1812. It thus covers much the same ground as the fourth and fifth volumes of Mr. Oman's fine history of the Peninsular War in somewhat less than half the space allotted to the same period by that author. Only sufficient attention is given to the other campaigns which were being simultaneously conducted elsewhere than in Spain to elucidate the situation when necessary. Mr. Oman has acknowledged his obligations to Mr. Fortescue repeatedly for his assistance, and the latter now reciprocates in like manner, although sometimes differing with him in a thoroughly frank and friendly way.

Mr. Fortescue's style is marked by sobriety and restraint but does not lack force and felicity of expression. He has sedulously avoided the "pitfall of panegyric". Praise and blame are distributed with an impartial hand. There are few "purple patches", yet his descriptions of the remarkable combat of Sabugal, the assault of Badajoz, and the attack at Salamanca are very vivid. His narrative is uniformly concise and lucid.

Following so soon in the footsteps of so competent and careful an investigator as Mr. Oman, he could scarcely hope to throw much fresh light on these events, but he has discovered important additional materials in a hitherto unused manuscript journal of Col. James Stanhope, who made good use of unusual opportunities for observation while attached to the staff, and has made a careful personal examination of unpublished official documents in the French Archives de Guerre. Like his predecessor, he has not neglected to visit the scene of the principal operations and thus has gained a more intimate knowledge of the country than is otherwise practicable. The influence of the lay of the land is duly appreciated, and the effect of foul weather upon military operations is forcibly presented, particularly in the case of the unfortunate besiegers of Tarifa.

Yet such a check would never have daunted French soldiers but for the appalling state of their camps and works . . . [he writes, p. 334]. The trenches were waist deep in water; the platforms of the guns were washed away; the guns themselves were sinking into the soil; the ammunition both for cannon and muskets was ruined, and the muskets them-

selves were unserviceable. The men were barefooted and their clothing in rags, they could get no sleep in their flooded quarters, they had been obliged to travel eight miles to discover fuel, which after all proved useless when found owing to the rain; all supplies were now cut off by swollen torrents and for four days they had received only quarter-rations of bread.

His chapter on the war with the United States shows less grasp of the subject and is defaced by some rather glaring errors.

The companion volume contains eighteen battle-plans and small maps and five larger maps of rare excellence, which illustrate the text in a highly satisfactory manner. Among these are plans of the combats of Barrosa, Sabugal, and Arroyo Molinos, two each of Fuentes d'Onoro, Albuera, and Salamanca, showing successive phases of these battles, and plans of the siege operations at Tarifa, Ciudad Rodrigo, Badajoz, Salamanca, and Burgos. Other maps illustrate Masséna's retreat, the operations on the Portuguese frontier from April to August, 1811, the operations on the Agueda in August and September, 1811, the operations around Salamanca in July and in November, 1812, and the operations in Spain from January to November, showing the northern and southern spheres of action separately, the dividing line being naturally the river Tagus. The routes of march and daily movements of the opposing forces are indicated with great care. Some unfortunate errors are evident, however, in the relative position of troops in the plan of Wellington's attack at Salamanca.

E. A. CRUIKSHANK.

*The Chartist Movement.* By the late MARK HOVELL, M.A., 2nd Lieutenant, the Sherwood Foresters, and Lecturer in Military History in the University; edited and completed, with a Memoir, by Professor T. F. TOUT. [Publications of the University of Manchester, Historical Series, no. XXXI.] (Manchester: University Press; London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1918. Pp. xxxvii, 327. 7 sh. 6 d.)

It is a great pity that such a splendid book as this should be not only the first but also the last written by its author. The young Englishman who gives in this volume such bright promise of a scholarly career died on the battle-front in 1916.

Recent years have given us several books of merit on the Chartist movement. Three doctoral dissertations in the Columbia University Studies in History, together with M. Dolléan's large volume, *Le Chartisme*, had, indeed, in the mind of this reviewer, seemed to cover all but definitively the major phases of the history of Chartism. The discovery of a new book at this time, characterized by both freshness of vision and mastery of analysis, came as a surprise.

Lieutenant Hovell has unquestionably written the best account extant

of Chartism in its earlier development. He has painted in the background of Chartism in masterly fashion, and several chapters of his book are remarkable not only for their general literary excellence, but also for a wealth of fact and material hitherto unpublished. Particularly noteworthy is the chapter on "Anti-Capitalistic Economics", with its analysis of the little-known book of William Ogilvie, *An Essay on the Rights of Property*, and also that of Charles Hall's *Effects of Civilization on the People in European States*. So predominant did Malthus and Ricardo become in the first third of the nineteenth century that the world, even the world of the scholar, has forgotten in large measure the wide undercurrent of protest in the very heyday of *laissez-faire's* glory.

The revival of the Birmingham Political Union and the history of the People's Parliament of 1848 are described at greater length and with more careful documentation than in any other history of the Chartist movement. Indeed, in so far as this book traces the history of Chartism to 1842 it may be said to be complete.

Unfortunately Lieutenant Hovell's military career prevented the completion of his book. For the latter part only a rough draft remained, which Professor Tout, together with several other friends of the author, prepared for publication. As was inevitable, this portion of the manuscript has suffered. For the relation of the Chartist movement to the Revolution of 1848, the conflict with the Anti-Corn Law League, and the economic vagaries of O'Connell, we must turn for fuller treatment to Slosson and Dolléan. Had he lived Lieutenant Hovell would doubtless have made this part of his history as full and as well proportioned as the earlier sections. As it is we cannot but feel grateful to his friends for putting into what shape they could the latter part of his manuscript.

Somewhere, sometime, the story of Richard Oastler's latter career will be unearthed from oblivion by some historian. The appreciation here shown to the Factory King led the reviewer to hope that he would find that done in this book. In the recesses of the British Museum lie guarded an incomplete record of Oastler's last little publication, *The Home, the Altar and the Cottage*. Up to the present no historian has apparently endeavored to link Oastler's late career as an agitator to any great extent with that of Chartism. That work remains yet to be done.

But with this history we find no fault. Needless to say it emphasizes, throughout, the economic and social crisis the distressing phases of which determined so largely the direction of the Chartist movement. In the midst of the world's turmoil it is refreshing to turn to a book so sympathetic and so comprehensive in its treatment of the social upheaval of mid-nineteenth-century England.

WALTER P. HALL.



*Li Hung Chang.* By J. O. P. BLAND. [Makers of the Nineteenth Century.] (London: Constable and Company; New York: Henry Holt and Company. Pp. vii, 327. \$2.00.)

IN this book Mr. Bland has written the latest but certainly not the last word on the life of the statesman whom he appraises "a maker of the nineteenth century in China to a greater degree than any of his contemporaries". From a pen which has such a record as has Mr. Bland's, dealing with a figure which had for so long a time and so conspicuously held the political stage as Li, much may rightfully be expected. The present volume disappoints. It has the flavor of a "made-to-order": it lacks the originality and the brilliant style of *China under the Empress Dowager*, it has not the free-hand strokes of *Recent Events and Present Policies*, and it is without the intimate and poignant interest of the *Annals and Memoirs of the Court of Peking*.

At the outset Mr. Bland gives an account of materials and at the conclusion a bibliographical note. The sources upon which he has relied are indicated in the summarizing sentence, "Our present study . . . must, therefore, be based more upon the recorded opinions of independent and competent European observers than upon the evidence of Chinese official records or Li's own posthumous papers" (p. 35). After paying his respects to the fraudulent "*Memoirs of Li Hung-chang*";<sup>1</sup> and pointing out that "few if any of the sentiments therein ascribed to Li Hung Chang were ever actually recorded by him", Mr. Bland nevertheless finds it convenient again and again to quote at length from this fabrication, whose nearest approach to authenticity he finds in the possibility that the American manufacturer had the assistance of the minds of "Young China".

Among chapters on the period, the early and home life, the official life, the diplomatic life, the career as naval and military administrator, and as statesman and politician, chapters IV. and V., on Li as Diplomat, form the *pièce de résistance* of the book.

The arrangement, topical rather than chronological, necessitates some amount of repetition, but this neither warrants nor excuses the excess thereof. It was a necessary part of the biographer's task to give the reader clearly to understand that Li Hung Chang, while serving his sovereign and his country, was also serving himself, but once the fact had been pointed out, it might have been left to the evidence to do the emphasizing. Mr. Bland has never been at a loss for words in expressing his opinion of the Chinese official system and its personnel; he is still in his best literary form when characterizing "the blear-eyed ineptitude of fossilized Mandarins". In comparison, and by reason of his positive qualities and achievements, Li is made to stand forth as a really great Chinese.

<sup>1</sup> Not without confusion, for on one page he speaks of its "carefully anonymous editor" and on the next page uses the "editor's" name. Mr. W. F. Man-nix's name appears on the title-page of the first edition of the "*Memoirs*".



Of the book as a whole, it may be said that expressions of opinion overtop the narrative. Nevertheless, the book has its very useful chapters, it sheds light on a variety of hitherto obscure points, and from the author's long familiarity with China's conditions and study of her problems there come occasional flashes of incisive judgment and illuminating exposition.

He [Li] had all the Oriental's contempt for those who demonstrate with force and are reluctant or afraid to use it [p. 216]. Viewed as a whole, Li's record as a statesman and domestic politician is distinguished from that of his most celebrated colleagues . . . by his steady perception of the fact that change was inevitable and that the path of wisdom lay in making timely preparations to meet it; also, in that he realized that the materials available for making such preparations were few and inadequate [p. 275]. With all his acuteness, he never appears to have realized that the weakness of the state was not a matter of mechanics, but of morals; that no military or financial reorganization could ever be effectively carried out without the inculcation of a keen sense of duty and public spirit in the official hierarchy [p. 293]. But, when all is said and done, he was the best and bravest steersman in the Empire, and for thirty years kept the ship in commission under the Dragon flag [p. 312].

STANLEY K. HORNBECK.

*The Guardians of the Gate: Historical Lectures on the Serbs.* By R. G. D. LAFFAN, C.F., Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1918. Pp. 299. 5 sh.)

BEFORE the outbreak of the Great War there was some excuse for ignorance upon the part of intelligent Americans about things Serbian because there existed few books in English upon the subject. During the past two years there have appeared the admirable works of Taylor, Savić, and Temperley, and to these must now be added this excellent book of Laffan. Written by an Englishman who was officially attached to the Serbian army, it evidences a deep sympathy and affection for the Serbian people and a sincere belief in the justice of their aspiration for the unity and independence of the South Slavs. But it everywhere shows a scholarly desire to discover the views of Serbia's enemies and a fine restraint from condemning anything except on what amounts to practically positive proof. It is not a polemic, not even a plea for the Serbian cause. It was written to give enlightenment to English-speaking peoples about a race of whom they had hitherto heard only from unfriendly sources, from German and Magyar writers. Mr. Laffan not only gives enlightenment but he carries conviction, and the impartial reader closes the book persuaded by the array of facts and reasons that justice is with the Serbs. Intelligent perusal of the book is helped by the three maps which are inserted, and the reader who is interested in continuing the study of the Serbs will be assisted by the discriminating bibliography which accompanies the book.

The author's chief aim is to explain the present status of the Serbs as "Guardians of the Gate", i. e., the gate to the East. To understand this he devotes the first quarter of the book to a brief but illuminating history of the Serbs down to the treaty of Berlin. In this history he explains not only the Serbs' political development but also their peculiar economic institutions such as the Zadruga; the great importance of their ballads and of their church in maintaining their national spirit during the Turkish night; and how to a peculiar degree the Serbs, unlike the Greeks and Bulgarians, achieved their own independence. In the second quarter of the volume the author describes the gradual evolution of Serbia from a condition of vassalage to Austria-Hungary under Milan to a state of independence under Peter down to 1914. In this part of his book Mr. Laffan shows an intimate and accurate knowledge of the diplomacy leading to the formation of the Balkan League, the Turkish war, and the fratricidal war between the Balkan allies.

The third quarter of the book explains the reasons for the Austro-German determination to remove the sole obstacle to the *Drang nach Osten*, the Guardian of the Gate. There exists no more inspiring story in all history than the account of the magnificent fight of the little state against overwhelming odds, in which she three times drove the armies of Austria-Hungary headlong over the border and succumbed only to a union of forces, of betrayal by Bulgaria, desertion by Greece, neglect by the Allies, and determination to bring about a decision by Germany. The final chapter describes the sad condition of the Serbs at the present time and their hopes for the future based wholly upon the event of an Allied victory. The pact of Corfu between Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, which will be the basis of the constitution of Yugoslavia, is given in full, and also a fair and restrained statement of the conflict of interests between South Slavs and Italians. The book is commended to the attention of intelligent laymen. It is not intended for scholars.

STEPHEN P. DUGGAN.

*The Roots of the War: a Non-Technical History of Europe, 1870-1914 A. D.* By WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS, Ph.D., in collaboration with WILLIAM ANDERSON, Ph.D., and MASON W. TYLER, Ph.D., of the University of Minnesota. (New York: Century Company. 1918. Pp. viii, 557. \$1.50.)

As the title suggests, this book is an attempt to simplify for the average intelligent citizen the complexity of factors which led up to the great catastrophe, and to the reviewer the attempt seems to have met with notable success. The book is an excellent example of the work of men who refuse to accept the old Oxonian dictum that "while it is easy to write something true and something interesting, it is impossible to write anything both true and interesting". The authors have discarded the orthodox phraseology of historical text-books, and, although they make no effort to attain what is termed "brilliancy" of style, the narrative

travels with an ease which will be appreciated by undergraduate and lay-reader. In this respect it is reminiscent of Gibbons's *New Map of Europe*, although the scope of the work is far more comprehensive. The titles of the various chapters suggest the successful break which the authors have made with the dead pedagogic style of history-writing: the Great War which bred a Greater; the Old Pilot and the New Captain of Germany; Sowing the Wind—the Serbian Note; Reaping the Whirlwind—the Scrap of Paper.

With very few exceptions the authors have avoided the pitfalls which beset the path of the man who sets out to make his narrative interesting reading. At times a carping critic might feel that the style was rather journalistic; the phrase "the mighty Queen Victoria" (who by the way is not listed in the index) suggests a questionable picture of the late monarch. The narrative is sometimes diffuse and a good deal of space is given to matter which one might expect to find in a letter to the *Times* rather than in a history, as for example the eight-page attack on Norman Angell. There are certain statements which might more wisely have been made in the form of surmises. But in general the narrative gains from not being over-condensed, and the authors have displayed a careful exercise of their critical faculties. In no case, so far as the reviewer can determine, have they allowed themselves to be led into inaccuracies or exaggerations for the sake of dramatic effect. They have simply given the dramatic character of their narrative a fair chance to appear.

The history begins with the Franco-Prussian War and a description of the new Germany and her neighbors. Thereafter it follows closely the thread of international affairs. With the exception of chapters on France and Italy, there is little attention paid to the domestic affairs of the various states except as internal conditions affected the relations of one nation with the other. By thus limiting the scope of their work the authors have secured a continuity which accounts in part for the interest of their narrative. The first half of the book is devoted chiefly to the Near East and the development of Germany; thereafter it proceeds upon orthodox lines—the rise of an international opposition, the growth of Pan-Germanism, the crises in Morocco and the Balkans, Russian policy, and the final catastrophe. Germany's actions in the Moroccan crises are interpreted as caused by a desire to gain prestige primarily, and the Kaiser's Tangiers speech is believed to have been arranged by von Bülow, a thesis which seems probable although it is contrary to the opinion of Witte as quoted by E. J. Dillon. The treaty of Bucharest, the authors believe, spelled "not lasting peace but new collisions". Particularly noteworthy are the characterization of the Kaiser and his surroundings and the chapter on Austria-Hungary, which summarizes with clear insight the essential problems of the intricate and baffling Hapsburg complex.

The proof-reading has not been perfect, and errors in proper names are likely to confuse the student. The title of Gayda's *L'Italia d'Oltre*

*Confine* was set up by someone obviously ignorant of Italian (p. 295, note); H. W. Steed appears as "Skeed" (p. 296, note); and E. D. Morel appears as "More" (p. 545).

CHARLES SEYMOUR.

*War Time Control of Industry: the Experience of England.* By HOWARD L. GRAY, Professor of History in Bryn Mawr College. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1918. Pp. xix, 307. \$1.75.)

THIS volume embodies a useful piece of work, carefully and conscientiously performed. It places in concise and well-classified form, and substantially in the order of their actual development, the chief legislative and executive measures adopted by the British government to cope with the exceptional economic problems forced upon the country by the Great War. This naturally involves statements of the attitudes and responses of the industrial classes in the face of new and constantly changing conditions which vitally affect at once their economic interests and their personal and industrial freedom.

To the industrial class, whether as employers or employed, in the central countries of Europe, the application of rigorous executive control, incidental to the war, brought no essential changes in policy or experience. What changes there were, and they have been very onerous, it is true, were changes in degree, not in kind. In Britain, however, above all countries, the changes which were effected to the end of 1917 have been of the most radical character, and only a general consciousness of the absolute necessity of the situation has forced the British people to realize that in order to save their freedom for the future they must sacrifice much of it for the present. Professor Gray's book is practically a record of the essential facts in that industrial revolution in Great Britain.

Naturally, one radical interference with economic freedom involves many secondary and complementary interferences, in the effort to maintain the industrial equilibrium. The war itself was, of course, the first and most radical of the rupturing influences. The chief objects of the British government since the outbreak of the war, have been to reconstruct and rearrange the demoralized industrial, trade, and financial systems of the country so as to meet, on the one hand, the indispensable requirements of the people, and, on the other, to concentrate the industrial activities of the nation on the production of vast and varied supplies for the conduct of the war. The practical operation and outcome of this dominating condition and the efforts to meet it, Professor Gray has sought to present in a concise and intelligible summary of facts with the minimum of comment. He has wisely confined his attention to the more urgent phases of government control, in a country situated as Britain is, during a war which affects so seriously her supply of food and raw materials. The phases of industrial control presented in the

volume are classified as follows: (a) Transportation, under the two natural divisions of railways and shipping; (b) The production of munitions and the troublesome labor problems which are naturally involved in such industries; (c) The coal industry, so vital to all phases of the British national industries and equally vital to the needs of her Continental allies; (d) The supply, in adequate quantities and at reasonable prices, of certain essential foreign products, such as wool, hides and leather, and food supplies, particularly sugar, meat, and bread. As connected with the food problem, the anxiety to insure as adequate a supply as possible of food products led to increasing efforts, not only to procure and conserve the available supplies from abroad, but to stimulate agricultural production at home.

In compiling the volume, the author has not only availed himself of the whole field of official publications and the responsible utterances of ministers, capitalists, and labor leaders, but has drawn from the standard organs of economic record and of public opinion.

ADAM SHORTT.

*Two War Years in Constantinople: Sketches of German and Young Turkish Ethics and Politics.* By Dr. HARRY STUERMER, late Correspondent of the *Kölnische Zeitung* in Constantinople (1915-1916). Translated from the German by E. Allen and the Author. (New York: George H. Doran Company. 1917. Pp. xiv, 292. \$1.50.)

DR. STUERMER is one of the small group of Germans who, unable to agree with the policies or condone the practices of their government, have set forth their condemnation in books which have been much appreciated by the enemies of Germany. While the author of *J'Accuse* wrote and published soon after the beginning of the war, and Prince Lichnowsky's views, though they transpired recently, were formed at the outset, Dr. Stuermer experienced a process of conversion two years later. He served in the first Hindenburg campaigns, was invalided out of the army, and became a newspaper correspondent in Constantinople. From long African experience favorably disposed toward English and French colonial methods, he became estranged from the Turks by their treatment of the Armenians, in which feeling he was strongly influenced by his Bohemian wife. This led him on to complete repudiation of the German cause in the present war; since, as he states, the official German policy was cowardly in not requiring the Turks to stop the massacres, conscienceless in showing no sympathy whatever for the Armenians, and stupid in failing to see that when the Armenians had been destroyed, Turkish nationalism would wish to expel German influence also. He resigned his position, and obtained permission to reside in Switzerland for his health. Once there, without, as he affirms, any external pressure or inducement whatever, he unburdened his soul in the composition of this book.

The work appears to be a thoroughly honest and sincere attempt by an intelligent and fairly well-educated man to relate the exact truth in regard to events of which he had first-hand or authoritative knowledge. Writers have seldom been in so favorable a position for furnishing uninfluenced material as was Dr. Stuermer, secure in neutral Switzerland, conscious that all ties were broken, and filled with strong emotion. The circumstances indeed caused him to introduce an unusual amount of explanation of his own mental processes, and feeling may now and then have disturbed his judgment.

Much information is given as regards the purposes and actions of the Young Turks. The verbal portraits of Enver, Talaat, and Jemal are carefully done, as well as those of certain disreputable German agents. Strong emphasis is laid upon the abandonment of Pan-Islamism in favor of Pan-Turanism, and the growing hatred of Germans and Turks. Dr. Stuermer falls in with the Entente programme as prepared before the collapse of Russia, which would "consolidate" the Turks finally into inner Anatolia.

Some errors occur, as the implication (p. 154) that the Capitulations were forced upon the Turks by Europeans, whereas they were granted freely by the Turks in their days of disdainful greatness. Not all ideas have been thought through: the Armenian deportations are traced "solely and only" to the Turkish "feeling of inferiority to that non-Turkish element" (p. 52), neglecting the influence of Turkish nationalism, which, however, is discerned as directed against Arabs. The translation is usually good and even spirited, but here and there it becomes obscure and even unintelligible. The Teutonized usage of "Rajah" for *rayah* ("the herd", a name applied by Turks to subject Christians) gives a wrong impression. There is a fairly full table of contents, but no index.

*Judaean Addresses, Selected.* Volume II. (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, for the "Judaean". 1917. Pp. 192.).

THE "Judaean" is an association formed for the purpose of promoting the intellectual and spiritual interests of Jews. In 1899 it published a volume of selected papers read before the society. The present volume contains thirty-two addresses by members or invited speakers, delivered between 1900 and 1917. Only a certain number of them are historical in character and subject. Some speculate as to the future, *e. g.*, as to a "return of their land to the Jews". In respect to that project it is natural to consider not only the space and resources of Palestine and the probable ratio of Jewish immigration under very favorable circumstances, but also how far the rights of others in that land should be recognized, how a sense of democratic equality will cope with the embarrassing fact of an actual Moslem majority in a state



designated as Jewish, how successfully the craving for a theocratic régime can be subdued, and what principles and ideals are likely to characterize the developing political leadership. One turns with interest to Mr. Samuel G. Hellmann's judgment on Disraeli:

He was a Jew more than he was an Englishman, and he was Disraeli more than he was a Jew. . . . he was never actuated by the highest impulses of unselfish ideals. . . . [yet] in his dual capacity as the shrewd politician of infinite resource and as the statesman daring to dream of vast empire he seems to me strikingly to combine both the practical and the ideal tendencies of the Jewish race.

Of course, neither the type nor the admiration of it is by any means limited to Israel; and it may not be wise or generous to speculate on the possible career of a Disraeli in the Holy City of three religions.

Is there a Jewish race? Sometimes the loose usage of the term is accepted without demur in these papers, sometimes the existence of any definite racial distinction is questioned, sometimes the anti-Semitic thrust is parried by a declaration that the Jew is not a Semite at all, but belongs to the same group of the white race as the Hittites, Armenians, and Persians, and yet "is to-day, on the whole, a remarkably pure race" (p. 112). Language is indeed in itself no reliable criterion of race. This must also be remembered, if it should turn out that the Hittites in Asia Minor spoke an Aryan language, which, however, has not yet been proven. An Iranian infiltration is as possible in Boghazkeui as in Mitani. In applying other criteria ethnologists must keep in closer touch with history than they are wont to do. Much of the Chaldaean stock obviously survived among the Haik of Armenia; and in examining modern skulls it must not be forgotten how many strains of diverse ethnic elements have mingled in Iran. The Judaeen was probably a somewhat purer Semite than the Israelite; but even he has, by the unequivocal testimony of his own literature, been to a great extent contaminated or improved by foreign blood both in ancient and in modern times in Palestine and elsewhere. He may be said to be, on the whole, remarkably well mixed; but it is at least open to question whether the character of the blend is not more due to social environment than to the persistence of traits of racial or sub-racial derivation. The attempt to explain all that is peculiar to the Jew, from his extraordinary economic capacity to his religion, by his nomadic life in the desert, is, Dr. Schulmann shows, altogether a mistake. He might have added that we know precious little about the nomadic life of Israel, and that Teuton, Celt, and Slav lived more recently in the nomadic state.

The accounts of the Jew in England by Dr. De Sola Pool, in France by Mr. Stroock, in Germany by Mr. Hühner, and in Holland, Italy, and Switzerland by Mr. Kuhn, set forth very clearly his loyalty as a citizen in these countries. Against the background of age-long oppression and persecution by Christian rulers and mobs, this recital of distinguished services to the several Christian states is tremendously effective. It



matters little whether "it is Luzzatti's work which is now in evidence in Italy's severance from her old allies", or d'Annunzio's, or that of forces vastly more powerful than any man's influence; whether Asser more than any other single individual, by effectively organizing the Hague Conferences, produced "the sacred respect thus far accorded to Dutch neutrality by all the belligerents during the present war"; or whether the world at large is more pleased to remember that Maximilian Harden is a Jew than to be told that "the Jews of Germany are Germans with all the virtues and all the failings of that nation". The point of loyalty is well established. Mr. Max J. Kohler's study of "The Jew in his Relation to the Law of the Land" is of historic importance and should be expanded into a much-needed volume on that subject. Those interested in Schnitzler's *Professor Bernhard* will enjoy Mr. Naumburg's description and appreciation of this drama. Dr. Henry Moskowitz, in a fine spirit and with deep insight, presents the problem of the Jew in New York. The volume closes with Professor Hollander's just protest in "The Novel Jew" against the nasty caricatures of his people in recent fiction. A unanimous resolution to the effect that a new *Nathan der Weise* be produced may not bring forth either a Mendelssohn or a Lessing. But it would not be strange if the world crisis should mature some consummate literary effort to portray Jewish life at its best, in its pathos and its grandeur, its natural simplicity and its subtle refinement, engaged with its own problem and that of the world, and becoming conscious of a function in the life of humanity more significant than either the traditionalist's devotion to the Mosaic law or the Zionist's dream of national power.

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.

#### BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*The Cambridge History of American Literature.* Edited by WILLIAM P. TRENT, JOHN ERSKINE, STUART P. SHERMAN, and CARL VAN DOREN. Volume I. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; Cambridge, England: University Press. 1917. Pp. xvii, 584. \$3 50.)

THIS work is an attempt to meet the obvious need of an extended history of American literature, embodying the ripest scholarship and the results of recent investigation. The three volumes, of some 600 pages each, will be written by "a numerous body of scholars from every section of the United States and from Canada", and will cover the entire field from the beginning down to 1900. Volume I. includes "Colonial and Revolutionary Literature", and "National Literature" through Emerson.

The first volume is somewhat disappointing. Its lack of unity in method and style is greater than need be, even in a work done by many

hands, provided the editors exercise due rigor. This they have not done. The first chapter, for example, is a peculiarly unhappy beginning for such a book because of its dilettante slightness; the chapter on early verse is tame, the more so by contrast with Professor Tyler's brilliant treatment of the same subject; while the discussion of the austere Bryant, although it contains many good things, is affected and too exuberant in style. The volume would be more readable and produce a far more unified effect, if the editors had demanded from all contributors a reasonable approximation to a standard style, simple, strong, and fresh, such as may be found in the admirable chapters on Franklin, early essayists, and Cooper. In method, too, it was unnecessary to allow so great diversity as appears in the chapters on fiction and the chapter on Irving; the former are models of critical writing, embodying the results of original research, and containing keen judgments excellently expressed; the latter is merely a pleasant, popular sketch, showing no special knowledge of Irving's sources and literary relationships, too constantly eulogistic, and making over-much of the service rendered to the author by a certain publishing house. The chapter on the early drama is too largely a list of names and titles. Mr. Paul Elmer More is not at his best in the chapter on Emerson, which seems perfunctory and is faulty in method, being quite inadequate in its consideration of Emerson's influence and of his style and verse. In brief, the volume is a collection of essays, very unequal in merit, rather than a coherent history of the first two and a half centuries of American literature.

Readers of the *Review* have special concern with the statement in the preface that the *History* "will be a survey of the life of the American people as expressed in their writings rather than a history of *belles-lettres* alone". In accordance with this purpose considerable space is given to authors whose significance is chiefly or wholly historical; the larger setting in American life, and the intellectual relations between the Old World and the New, are well sketched in parts of the book, notably the chapters on philosophers and divines, colonial newspapers and magazines, later travellers and observers, and Transcendentalism. But the plan has not been carried out consistently. The chapters on early travellers and explorers, Puritan divines, and the beginnings of verse, make comparatively little of the social and political background. The Mathers in particular are treated with scant sympathy and with a brevity disproportioned to their historical significance; the colonial literature on witchcraft is practically ignored; and the diary of Samuel Sewall, so rich in illustrative detail about the life of his times, is mentioned and quoted, very briefly, but once.

The historical value of the first half of the volume is much lessened, furthermore, by a radical fault of construction. The material is grouped under various heads, and the survey of each group is carried a certain distance. Unfortunately the distance is in several instances so great—more than a century and a half—that the reader passes into a totally

new set of conditions before the end, as in the first chapter, which begins with adventurers and explorers, in 1583, and concludes with a pleasure trip from Maryland to New Hampshire in 1744. It is also unfortunate, for the sense of historical continuity, that the reader is again and again turned back to the very beginning. Thus, after reading of Edwards, Franklin, and *The Federalist*, he is dragged back to 1610 in the next chapter, on colonial verse. In a work on so ample a scale the literary product of each half-century, or of some period having a reasonable degree of unity, should have been treated by itself, and the reader thus helped to a unified and coherent view of the development of American literature and life.

In spite of grave faults the volume is a valuable piece of work, chiefly because of the accuracy of its scholarship and the soundness of its literary judgments, in the main, together with its encyclopaedic character. Its value is much increased for the student by the bibliography, which fills 204 pages of the 584, and is on the whole carefully and judiciously made. The index would be more useful if it included subjects as well as authors and titles.

WALTER C. BRONSON.

*Historic Mackinac: the Historical, Picturesque, and Legendary Features of the Mackinac Country.* By EDWIN O. WOOD. In two volumes. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1918. Pp. xv, 697; xiii, 773. \$12.50.)

THIS is a sumptuously printed work about a rarely attractive subject. No less fortunate in its history than in its natural attractions, the "fairly island" of Mackinac radiates a charm which is as difficult to define as it is easy to appreciate. To its spell our author long since succumbed, and the present work, pre-eminently a labor of love, represents his attempt to put in print for the benefit of others something of the feeling of affection for Mackinac with which his local residence and studies have imbued him. Physically considered, the book is delightful. The press-work is excellent, the binding is good, and the illustrations are numerous and attractive. The first volume is devoted to a general historical narrative of Old Mackinac through the three centuries of French, British, and American occupation. The second is composed of selected articles dealing with the legends and history of early Mackinac, drawn from such sources as the *Wisconsin Historical Society Collections*, and the writings of Schoolcraft, Harriet Martineau, Margaret Fuller, T. L. McKenney, Bayard Taylor, Mrs. Kinzie, and Mrs. Jameson.

In view of the character of volume II. there is no occasion for subjecting it to critical consideration. Such consideration of volume I. must fairly begin with the author's own conception of his work. Premising with a statement of the circumstances which aroused his interest in Mackinac, he frankly disclaims for his volumes "rank with the achieve-

ments of historians. They represent merely the attempt of a layman to bring together from this collection [his own private library] some leading features which seemed to be of especial interest". Nor is this attempt at self-appreciation unduly modest. The volume is largely a compilation, in which quotations are of frequent occurrence and frequently of great length. Thus, the narrative of Pontiac's massacre (pp. 157-209) is taken mainly from Parkman and Henry; the chapter on "the English and the Indians" (134-157) is compiled (largely quoted) from Henry, Nevins's edition of *Ponteach*, and Hough's *Diary of the Siege of Detroit*. Taking for granted the plan of composition adopted by the author, his work has been not unskillfully done. He has delved widely among the printed materials available for his theme, and has constructed, on the whole, a readable and interesting narrative. Its gravest defect, perhaps, from the scholarly point of view, proceeds as an inevitable consequence from the author's limitations as a "layman" in the historical field. There is no attempt made, consciously or unconsciously, to evaluate the great store of materials which has been drawn upon in the construction of the narrative. Thus, in the account of Pontiac, Cooley's *Michigan* is offered as an authority, and, worse still, the *Lives of Famous Indian Chiefs* by the American Indian Historical Publishing Company of Aurora, Ill. From the latter work is presented a full-page portrait of Pontiac, although in this case the statement is appended that according to C. M. Burton there is no authentic portrait of the chieftain. Another illustration of the absence of critical evaluation is the crediting twice (pp. 171 and 175) of the ancient romance attributing the failure of Pontiac's plot against Fort Detroit to secret information given to Major Gladwin by his Indian mistress.

From the scholarly point of view it is a matter for regret that the publication of such an ambitious work should evidence so little constructive scholarship. The extensive manuscript collections pertinent to the subject seem to have gone wholly unworked. Much use has been made of the original materials in print, but even here there is little evidence of mastery of the subjects discussed, the author being commonly content with adducing excerpts and quotations from the writings of others, without subjecting them to that course of study and criticism which enables him to reach and state conclusions of his own.

In what has been said it is farthest from our wish to depreciate such essays at local historical writing as the one of Mr. Wood. A professional historian might have done the task better, perhaps, but the fact remains that it has been left to Mr. Wood to essay it at all. His work will fulfill a useful function in aiding the popular spread of historical interest in the region with which it deals. It will not be of very material assistance to the scholarly student of this field of American history.

*The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution, 1763-1776.*

By ARTHUR MEIER SCHLESINGER, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. LXXVIII.] (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1918. Pp. 647. \$4.00.)

IN his elaborate study of the colonial merchants and the American Revolution, Professor Schlesinger has made the most important original contribution to colonial history that we have had in a long time. His work is noteworthy not only for the light which it everywhere throws on the events of the pre-Revolutionary period, but also for its value as a model of creative reasearch. He has taken up a subject which has for years been in lamentable need of an investigator; his treatment is of that scientific and thoroughgoing sort which is worth more than reams of speculation and popularization within the limits of knowledge already acquired; his range is wide—not one colony but all the colonies considered as a whole and comparatively; and his material is more than official records and the correspondence of statesmen, it consists in largest part of newspapers—a little-worked mine of the right kind of information—letter-books, diaries, pamphlets, and the hundred and one sources of minor details, which disclose the thoughts and activities of the average man and when pieced together suggest new and unexpected interpretations.

Professor Schlesinger has approached a very large and important task with energy, courage, and enthusiasm, and has handled the data which he has collected not only with insight and understanding but also with remarkable firmness, fairness, and dispassionate judgment. There is not a trace of patriotic piety in his pages. He does not hesitate to call a "patriot" an agitator and a radical or a scoundrel; if need be, to speak of him as one whose brains were often in his biceps, and to characterize his methods as frequently lawless and sometimes abominably unjust. Likewise, he is not deterred from saying that the Loyalists were high-minded, reasonable, and honorable gentlemen, as frequently was the case, nor from praising their attitude of conservatism and conciliation. He is true to his duty as an historian when he refuses to worship at the shrine of patriotism or to twist and warp the truth, however unpalatable that truth may be. It is an unhappy fact that more errors in the writing of American history have been committed in the name of patriotism than were ever dreamed of in Horatio's philosophy.

The story that Professor Schlesinger tells us is not the whole story of the years before the Revolution, but it is a very important part of that story and one that has hitherto been strangely ignored. It concerns the activities of the merchants who were engaged in trade and commerce, whose welfare was bound up with that of the mother-country, and whose prosperity was dependent on the continuance of business relations with their fellow-merchants in England. It concerns those whose desire was to obtain a redress of trade grievances by

legitimate and peaceful means, and not by political agitation or armed revolt. They were the moderates, a large and influential body, who labored long and successfully for peace, and by using non-intercourse as a weapon were able to swing majorities in Parliament and to stave off radical measures until the very eve of the Revolution. The tea question lured them to combine with the patriotic party which they had hitherto opposed, an alliance in which they were outwitted and outmatched by the superior political skill of the radical leaders, who in the First Continental Congress committed the country, without any mandate therefor, to an alignment of parties and a definition of policy. This was the result, often demonstrated in history, of the superior offensive and eventual victory of a small group of determined radicals, well organized and astutely led, over a larger but less articulated moderate element, upholding a cause that was probably favored by a majority of the colonial population.

What we now need is an equally thorough, honest, and impartial study of the radical movement itself, of Sam Adams and his fellow-agitators, and of the methods whereby the "patriots" committed the country to war. We also need some reinforcement and enlargement even of Professor Schlesinger's own account, along the line of trade grievances, of the working of the trade laws after 1763, and especially of the co-operative activities of the merchants in England and Scotland. Professor Schlesinger's handling of the tea question is one of the best of the many good things in his book, but we must know more about the money situation and about business conditions before final conclusions can be reached. As it is, however, what Professor Schlesinger has written will stand as a landmark in our progress toward a better understanding of the causes of the Revolution.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*The West Florida Controversy, 1798-1813: a Study in American Diplomacy.* By ISAAC JOSLIN COX, Associate Professor of History, University of Cincinnati. [The Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History, 1912.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1918. Pp. xii, 699. \$3.00.)

WEST FLORIDA was the district on the Gulf of Mexico extending from the Mississippi to the Perdido River, and was like the pin upon which are thrown the rings in the game of shuffleboard. It was a meeting-ground where overlapped the Spanish claim to Florida, the French claim to Louisiana, and the British claim inherited by Georgia to territory south of the Ohio River. The earlier part of the book discusses briefly but satisfactorily these overlapping claims, which made the east, or Mobile district, to Edward A. Freeman the most complicated historical puzzle in the world. And Mr. Freeman had made a specialty of the Balkan region! The centre of Dr. Cox's story is the Baton Rouge part of the district.



Godoy, though forced to agree upon the boundary line of thirty-one degrees, succeeded in postponing the delivery of possession of the ceded territory until 1798, when Ellicott surveyed the southern line eastward from the Mississippi to the Atlantic. This left the Americans at Fort Adams on the Mississippi and Fort Stoddert on the Mobile River facing the Spaniards below the line; but these American outposts represented a growing nationality from above, while West Florida was merely a narrow strip of land hardly fifty miles wide, with few people, and of little value except for control of the Mississippi and the great Choctaw and Chickasaw tribes of Indians. The clause in the treaty of 1803, conveying Louisiana "with the same extent as it now has in the hands of Spain, and that it had when France possessed it; and such as it should be after the treaty subsequently entered into between Spain and other states", was a Pandora box, the United States claiming to the Perdido as the original eastern boundary of Louisiana, and Spain insisting that this was at Lake Pontchartrain, inasmuch as subsequent treaties had narrowed Louisiana by carving out of it in 1763 the province of West Florida. This view was held by Napoleon and Talleyrand. The American State Department claimed otherwise, and subsequently the decision of Chief Justice Marshall in *Foster v. Neilson* (2 Pet. 253), held that the judiciary in passing on private rights will follow the contention made by the political department in public matters. However, from fear of Napoleon, the United States never ventured to take possession. This produced a very unsatisfactory condition of the frontier, bringing out on the one hand the ingenuity of American diplomacy under Madison, Adams, and Monroe, not wholly creditable to the Americans, and on the other hand the persistence of the American frontiersmen, who really solved the problem. Such men as Toulmin, Kemper, Kennedy, and Caller on the American side, and Lanzos, Folch, and his enemy Morales, and Innerarity on the Spanish, not to insist upon the geographer Collot and semi-Indian Milfort on the French, the treacherous Wilkinson on every side, and the Mobileña Society modelled on the contemporary political Masonic lodges of Spain, are interesting studies in character; for, as Governor Claiborne at New Orleans said, "a more heterogeneous mass of good and evil was never before met in the same extent of territory".

The study becomes kaleidoscopic when we add elements due to Burr's conspiracy, Jefferson's Embargo, and the revolutions of Spanish America resulting from Napoleon's elevation of Joseph Bonaparte to the throne of Spain, and the revolt of the Spanish people. What have been looked at as local events were part of this world-movement. At Baton Rouge the Spanish commandant De Lassus had to recognize local self-government asked for by the residents. When he grew helpless, they overpowered him and his garrison and proclaimed the free and independent state of West Florida. They negotiated for admission into the Union, but were none too friendly with Mississippi Territory above



or Orleans Territory below them. The correspondence of Holmes and Claiborne, governors of these two territories, gives many details heretofore only partially known. The United States at last quietly overthrew the pseudo-state and in 1812 annexed the district to the new state of Louisiana. Meanwhile the Mobile end of the district had already been taken over by Wilkinson, "without the effusion of a drop of blood", as he expressed it, and was incorporated into Mississippi Territory. When an agreement for purchase of Florida was reached the ingenuity of Adams gave it the form that "His Catholic Majesty cedes to the United States all the territories which belonged to him situated eastward of the Mississippi", without defining them; and thus the Cortes was able to save its face and ratify the treaty of 1819.

The story is a long one and it may be doubted whether it hangs upon one thread sufficiently to be the subject of one book. This one could be improved by condensation and by putting some of the material into an appendix, but it is well told and constitutes rather the *Iliad* of the restless pioneer than the achievement of the timid statesmen. Nevertheless in this first American advance at the expense of crumbling Spain there comes with Jefferson in 1808 the declaration that the American object "was to exclude all European influence from the hemisphere", and two years later Madison's, that the United States could not permit disturbances to remain unchecked in her immediate neighborhood—doctrines to bear fruit after many years. This advance was to continue until it ingrained in Latin-Americans the distrust which was to be so great an obstacle to Pan-American declarations.

The material of this work was derived from government archives at Washington, Seville, and elsewhere, as well as from local records at Mobile. There is, however, little reference to early court files of Washington County or of the Baton Rouge country, for historians have not yet come to realize how fully law in practice mirrors civil life. Typographically, the book, although thick, is well put up, with several rough but illustrative maps. These as well as the text contain a few instances of misspelling, such as Dauphin Island for Dauphine, and Fort St. Stephens for Fort St. Stephen.

PETER J. HAMILTON.

*My Reminiscences.* By RAPHAEL PUMPELLY. In two volumes. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1918. Pp. xiii, 438; xi, 439-844. \$7.50.)

THE interesting experiences of an adventurous American through nearly eighty years of active life, from childhood in the Susquehanna Valley at Owego, N. Y., to his archaeological explorations in Turkestan at the age of sixty-seven, and his last journey across the deserts of Arizona eleven years later; glimpses into the life of an energetic, unconventional spirit, eager for strange exploits, and fearless of bodily harm; a disconnected narrative of reckless daring and shifting pur-

pose; the romance of a scientific man inheriting a brilliant mental endowment, substituting the school of world-wide experience for the routine of systematic education, and profiting by the fortunate chance of remarkable opportunities aided by sagacious instinct and a lenient fate; such are some of the impressions gained from the *Reminiscences* of Raphael Pumpelly.

At an early age he began a dual life of science and adventure, when at eight Hugh Miller's *Old Red Sandstone* started him hunting fossils, and at ten *The Pirate's Own Book* started him on a campaign of juvenile outlawry, which shortly brought him to a full sense of the stern realities of life, and incidentally to boarding school. In this connection there are allusions to the settlement of the Susquehanna Valley and the lumber-trade in that region, to school life at White Plains, N. Y., and in New Haven, Conn., from 1848 to 1854. Instead of going to Yale he persuaded his mother to take him to Europe at the age of fourteen, to finish his education. Two years spent in Germany, France, and Italy were devoted to picking up languages and learning the ways of social life as it existed there at that time.

The most remarkable and characteristic episode of his adventurous career was his casual trip to Corsica at the age of sixteen. Leaving his mother in Florence, he went out for a day's excursion; took a train for the sea-coast, then a steamboat to Corsica; decided to make a short visit to an interior town, then to explore a mountain; lived with shepherds, wandered about the island enjoying the wild life and gathering information about the people, their vendettas, and their romance. At the end of four months he returned to Italy, to find that his mother had given him up for lost, and had been greatly inconvenienced by the absence of the family letter of credit.

Chance turned his attention to the study of mining at Freiberg in Saxony, and life there from 1857 to 1859 furnished varied and entertaining reminiscences. Two years in the mining regions of Arizona were full of peril from Apache Indians, and were the most dangerous period of his life. Then follow two years of governmental service in Japan where travelling was much more novel than in these days. A visit to China was prolonged to eighteen months, and included expeditions to several mining districts. In October, 1864, he started on a winter journey through Mongolia and Siberia to Russia, the account of which is full of interest. At the end of six months he was in western Europe.

After returning to America his work from 1867 was in the Lake Superior iron and copper regions, where he was a pioneer explorer. Later he directed geological surveys in Michigan, Missouri, and along the route of the Northern Transcontinental Railroad. He was connected with the United States Geological Survey and the Tenth Census. In 1903 and 1904 he made expeditions into Turkestan to explore the remains of ancient cities along the margin of the great desert, a period

which he considers the most interesting part of his life. Then follow years of sojourn in Europe, and in 1915 a trip across the deserts of Arizona. Observations on peoples and customs, descriptions of countries visited, and anecdotes incident to his journeys maintain one's interest in the somewhat disconnected narrative of Professor Pumpelly's eventful life.

JOSEPH P. IDDINGS.

*Reconstruction in Louisiana after 1868.* By ELLA LONN, Ph.D., Assistant Professor in Grinnell College. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1918. Pp. vi, 538. \$3.00.)

To undertake to write a fair and connected narrative of events so recent and so obscured by partizan bitterness as those of the Reconstruction era in Louisiana, requires courage and a patient coolness of judgment that one rarely finds. Miss Lonn's *Reconstruction in Louisiana*, covering the period from 1868 to the election of Hayes and the establishment of Nicholls's authority, is as good as one could expect, in regard to completeness of detail, general accuracy, and fairness. There are, however, certain shortcomings to which attention must be directed.

In the mere matter of printing, there are some errors: on page 37, "leaving movers", for leading (Louisiana wished they had been leaving); page 29, "Bernard", for St. Bernard; page 132, "four hundred thousand", for four thousand; page 157, note 1, "Houme"; page 299, note 1, "Jahhawkker"; page 493, "F. F. Nicholls", for F. T.; page 514, "Darrell", for Durrell.

In a work of such detail, however, these errors are negligible; indeed, Miss Lonn has done a remarkable piece of work in regard to the general accuracy of her statements, all of which are supported by the best authority available. Sometimes, it is true, she makes a slip that is not pleasant: thus (p. 161) she describes D. B. Penn, candidate for lieutenant-governor with McEnery, as "colored, Warmoth party", though on page 270 and elsewhere in connection with the uprising of September 14 in New Orleans she correctly recognizes him as a Confederate soldier connected with some of the most prominent families of the state and enjoying the confidence of his people.

The most serious defects of this painstaking work, however, are rather in matters of style and general handling of the material. In the space at my disposal I can do no more than indicate, in the most general way, that the narrative is, at times, conspicuously lacking in that sort of orderly continuity which makes for clearness and for interest. At times, also, the writer composes sentences which, like this on page 68, seem to state the exact reverse of what is meant: "he laid the blame for the excesses on lobbyists, nor did he scruple to withhold names". Most frequently there is a failure to present the complex details in such a way as to make the situation clear; for example, in summarizing the

conditions existing at the beginning of 1869 (p. 9 *et seq.*), insufficient attention is paid to the highly important matter of the relation of Louisiana politics to the "national game" being played by the Congressional leaders. It will not, in my judgment, be possible to understand what went on in Louisiana without a frank, if concise, statement of national conditions. Similarly, in the handling of such a matter as the Colfax massacre, though Miss Lonn is perfectly unprejudiced, her narrative is not presented with that sort of clearness and vigor that should be perfectly consistent with accuracy and fairness. She is too timid about expressing opinions; it is not enough to present the facts, to quote freely the conflicting partizan opinions of the time (as on pp. 260-267); the function of the historian should be to digest and interpret where it is needful.

The volume will be welcome to the student, and should find a place in every library dealing with American history. But its value to the student would be very much greater if the index were more complete and better classified.

PIERCE BUTLER.

*The Autobiography of a Pennsylvanian.* By SAMUEL WHITAKER PENNYPACKER, Governor of Pennsylvania, 1903-1907. (Philadelphia: John C. Winston Company. 1918. Pp. 564. \$3.00.)

PROBABLY no state in the Union has ever had a governor with a mind so original as that of Samuel W. Pennypacker of Pennsylvania. With purposes which on the whole were fine, ideas on the most various subjects which were suggestive, turns of phrase which were unexpected and frequently bizarre, he was a man above others to be thanked for having bequeathed us an account of his life. Without question no book is quite like this one. The outlook at times is not from any great eminence. The tower on which the writer stood was not of the highest, but from where he did stand he saw with penetrating eye and has now given others his impressions with courage and fidelity.

As an industrious antiquary and annalist on Pennsylvania topics, well known, wherever he was known at all, for his loyalty to the history and the traditions of the state, the president for many years of the good and useful Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Governor Pennypacker as a matter of course has brought into his autobiography much that bears upon this branch of learning. He gained impressions and cherished recollections of a large number of men, many of no repute outside of their own community, though not a few were of national stature. The writer of American history for the period will find it profitable, therefore, to refer to the work; the writer of local history must find it indispensable to do so.

The criticism of men still living and of events and policies still lying within the range of daily conflict is rather perilous. That the author is deceased and is in a way protected by the *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*,

does not completely close the door to rejoinder. The chapters included in this volume earlier appeared in several of the newspapers of the state which obtained the rights to their use. Their publication led not unnaturally to charges of doubtful taste. This will be the price of immediate publication of such literary matter. A well-known Philadelphian, a contemporary of Governor Pennypacker, whose death only a short while preceded his, kept a journal but stipulated that it should not be published for a century. It would be difficult to imagine the pother which must have arisen if the diaries of John Quincy Adams and Gideon Welles had come to the light of day while those persons of whom the authors spoke were still alive. One was published twenty-six years, the other thirty-three years, after the death of the diarists, and even then both drew upon themselves the inevitable penalty of being thought ill-humored, uncharitable, and egotistical old gentlemen. What labor the daily insertion of descriptions and judgments in a diary entails upon a man living in the midst of arduous engagements (and no other need essay the task, for he will have little to tell) few who have not done so much can know. The writing of an autobiography is similarly laborious. What gives it worth is the fact that it is done in the heat of feeling and that it is an honest and truthful reflection of experience. It were idle for any with pretense to wisdom to complain of the inclusion, in a writing of this kind, of the very things which if they were wanting would deprive it of its reason for existence.

The historian may not accept the judgment but he may pause to note what Governor Pennypacker thought of Senator Quay:

Quay had earnestly tried to do a service for Pennsylvania. Little esteem did he win by the effort. The difference between his reputation and that of Clay over the country and abroad consists in the fact that Kentucky stood firmly behind Clay with all of his faults and that Pennsylvania, so far as expression went, failed so to stand behind Quay with all his merits (p. 281, *cf.* p. 351).

The Governor was frankly not a democrat:

Often an imp of a demagogue leads a herd of swine into the sea and there they are drowned. The real truth of the matter is that the masses of the people are ill trained and uninformed. . . . It may be conceded that, given sufficient time, the popular judgment is apt to settle upon the correct principles, yet in the meantime Joan of Arc has been burned to death, Poland has been parted in fragments, the Boers have been robbed of their mines, and the Capitol at Washington has been laid in ashes (p. 279).

None can peruse this volume without finding in it matter for thought and discussion. Now and then he will be invigorated by what he will meet with as he turns the pages; at other times amused by the writer's conscious or, as we must think, often unconscious humor. The Pennypacker name will have long life in the history of the governor's office in Pennsylvania, and this book will be a material aid to the attainment of that end.

ELLIS PAXSON OBERHOLTZER.

*The Foreign Policy of Woodrow Wilson, 1913-1917.* By EDGAR E. ROBINSON and VICTOR J. WEST, Assistant Professors of American History and of Political Science in Leland Stanford Junior University. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1917. Pp. 428. \$1.75.)

*Le Président Wilson et l'Évolution de la Politique Étrangère des États-Unis.* Par Sir THOMAS BARCLAY. Préface de M. PAUL PAINLEVÉ, Membre de l'Institut, Ancien Président du Conseil des Ministres. (Paris: Armand Colin. 1918. Pp. vii, 289. 3 fr. 50.)

THE two books under review, though in many ways quite different, are alike in that both consist mainly of documents or extracts from other books. As a study and as a document-book that of Robinson and West is the better of the two. But neither book furnishes the reader a thoroughly adequate and satisfactory account of the foreign policy of President Wilson.

Part III. of Robinson and West, making up over half of the book, consists of ninety utterances of President Wilson, or his Secretary of State, upon the foreign policy of the United States from March, 1913, to August 27, 1917. Twenty are given in full, seventy are represented by extracts. Nearly every important public utterance of President Wilson on foreign affairs is included. Part II. is a chronological table giving in considerable detail the more important events in American foreign relations for the period. Cross-references to the documents in part III. are included. The editorial work in both of these parts has been admirably done in every particular. The publication of the book is fully justified by the high value of these two parts.

In the study of President Wilson's foreign policy in part I. Robinson and West have been much less successful than in their editorial work. In the opinion of the reviewer their highly laudatory estimate of the policy is fully warranted. But a much stronger case in support of that estimate might have been presented. The authors do little more than string together paraphrases and briefer quotations from the documents furnished in part III. While in one sense President Wilson's utterances are undoubtedly the best justification of his policy, the reviewer is of the opinion that the authors should have given their study a much broader scope. Sharper emphasis upon the transformations through which the policy has gone, fuller explanation of the events and circumstances leading to those changes, more attention to the criticisms brought against the policy, and to manifestations of public opinion, would have added much to the value of the study.

Sir Thomas Barclay has scattered through his little volume copious extracts from well-known books on American affairs by Bryce, Roosevelt, Boutmy, Coolidge, and a few others. Washington's Farewell Address is inserted in one of the chapters, while the Constitution of the

United States and nine of the most important state papers of President Wilson are printed as appendixes. The author's own contribution consists of seven short chapters of comment upon the rôle of the President and of the party system in the United States, and the personality and the foreign policy of President Wilson. M. Paul Painlevé has contributed a brief but striking preface. The volume is obviously a war book, quickly prepared to meet an urgent demand. It represents the impressions of a well-informed publicist who knows much about the public affairs of many countries, but more of Europe than of America. While there is much in the book to which exception might be taken in respect to correct comprehension of American history of earlier date, the view which it presents of the course taken by the United States in regard to the war is in general correct and appreciative. As that is the part by which its readers are most likely to be impressed, it will undoubtedly serve a useful public purpose.

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

*The Philippines to the End of the Military Régime: America Overseas.* By CHARLES BURKE ELLIOTT, Ph.D., LL.D. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company. [1916.] Pp. [xx], 541. \$4.50.)

*The Philippines to the End of the Commission Government: a Study in Tropical Democracy.* By the same. (*Ibid.* [1917.] Pp. [xxii], 541. \$4.50.)

THESE two volumes, although issued separately, really form a single continuous unit, and might better have been published as volumes I. and II. of the same work. They are capital books for a general library or for a special collection on the Philippines and the Far East. Taken in connection with the two posthumous volumes of James A. LeRoy, namely, *The Americans in the Philippines* (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914), unfortunately unfinished at the death of the author, they permit of a very fair estimate of the work of the United States in the Philippine Islands. Judge Elliott (at present associate justice of the supreme court of Minnesota) was himself a distinguished official in the Philippine Islands, first as associate justice of the supreme court, and later as a member of the Philippine Commission with the portfolio of commerce and police. He was, therefore, in close touch with the government that had been set up in the Philippines by the United States, and should be expected to speak with authority on all questions connected with that government, especially the Commission government. He is also a keen, though unpretentious and modest, student of men and affairs, and his opinions are worthy of attention.

Both volumes show unusually wide reading, and in addition to standard and well-known authorities, both of them contain in the foot-notes many excellent bibliographical references not usually cited. In addi-



tion, the second volume contains a good working bibliography (by no means complete) of books and articles on colonization and colonial problems and the Philippines, the latter section including "Books and Important Pamphlets" and "Documents and other Government Publications". Both volumes are written in a spirit of sympathy and of fairness toward American and Filipino, and with no apology to either when the author cannot agree with or countenance any action or policy. He makes no attempt to hide his disagreement with certain acts and policies of the Forbes administration, of which he was himself a part, nor does he hesitate to condemn any tendency in the present administration, with which he is not in harmony, and while considerate toward the Filipino, he does not always deal in honeyed phrases. He is severe, but not unjust, toward the so-called anti-imperialistic movement, and he insists on the legality of the United States occupation of the Philippines, the lack of any chicanery or any double-dealing with Aguinaldo and the Filipino insurgents, the fair-mindedness of Admiral Dewey, and the honest and sincere efforts of the majority of Americans connected with the Philippines. On the other hand, he has not been slow to praise any qualities and capacities manifest in the Filipinos, or the progress attained by them, although the difference of nationality will doubtless cause Filipinos to disagree with some of his conclusions. On the whole, the work bears the stamp of optimism, tempered somewhat by fear lest the government of the United States has permitted too rapid an advance to the Filipinos in self-government, especially since the inception of the Harrison administration and the passage of the so-called Jones Bill.

Both volumes are marred greatly by numerous errors in proof-reading, which are seen especially in geographical and other proper names and foreign words and phrases. A few citations will be sufficient to show this, but it is hoped that if a second edition of this work is published, care will be taken to correct all errors of proof-reading. In volume I. the French quotation is badly confused (pp. 52-53); "Maravales" occurs instead of Mariveles (p. 71); "Zertschrift" for Zeitschrift (p. 86); "Caspar" for Gaspar (p. 105); "Homonlion" for Homonhon (p. 143); "Badojis" for Badajoz (p. 145); "picus" for pieuse (p. 149, note 18); "Grigolva" for Grijalva (note 19); "pacification" for pacificación and "conquesto" for conquista (p. 151); Arthur Helps appears as "Arthur Heaps" (p. 180, note 25), and the author of *The Mastery of the Pacific* masquerades as "Coleridge" (p. 373). The second volume also contains many errors of like nature, but not so many as the first.

The first volume contains eighteen chapters, divided as follows: Introductory, The Theory and Practice of Colonization; part I., The Land and the People, chapters II.-IV.; part II., The Historical Background, chapters V.-VII.; part III., The Spanish Colonial System, chapters VIII.-XI.; part IV., American Occupation and Change of Sovereignty,

chapters XII.-XVIII. The necessity for the introductory chapter might be questioned, although it is of convenience to the general reader. Only the latter part of it deals specifically with the United States and the Philippines. In part I. is given a general description of the Philippines and of the native peoples; in part II., the discovery and conquest, two and a half centuries of stagnation, and the awakening and revolt of the Filipinos; in part III., the Spanish governmental organization, legislation, codes and courts, taxation and revenue, and personal status and trade restrictions; and in part IV., to which the preceding parts are but a preface, the capture of Manila by United States forces, the peace protocol and the treaty of Paris, the policy of expansion and the anti-imperialists, the diplomacy of the consulates (being the early relations with the Filipino insurgents), the period of military occupation, the Filipino rebellion and the days of the empire, and the end of the military régime. The descriptive part abounds in well-written passages, and the book throughout is written in a very readable style, with a few lapses, however, from the dignity that a book of this character should maintain. There are many generalizations which show keen insight, such for instance as (p. 41) that the United States "skilfully adopted as her own the cry which the Filipinos had raised of 'the Philippines for the Filipinos', and has been able in a measure to direct a movement which could not be suppressed". The parts dealing with the peoples of the Philippines leave much to be desired, and the same is true of the chapters on historical backgrounds, though part III. will be read with interest, and the wish that it were longer. In the fourth part, however, there is much sound matter, and this part of the book will be read to advantage, especially the chapter dealing with the peace protocol and the treaty of Paris.

The second volume consists of nineteen chapters which treat of the following: the new civil government; the aftermath of war; disentangling Church and State—the friar lands; congressional legislation for the Philippines; the provinces and municipalities; the commission government and its administration; finance, taxation, and trade; defense and public safety—the army and navy; sanitation and health; the Philippine schools; the labor problem; the policy of material development; transportation and communication; Philippine agriculture; policies and personnel; the independence movement and the reorganized government. There are also useful appendixes as follows: treaty of peace between the United States and Spain of December 10, 1898; instructions of the President to the Schurman commission; instructions to the Taft commission; three proclamations of Aguinaldo; the constitution of the Philippine republic; a list of leading officials of the Philippine government; the Philippine government law of 1916; and a statement of the cost of the army in the Philippines. This volume is a contribution to our knowledge of the Philippines and is worth careful reading, as it contains information along a great many lines on which there is constant

inquiry. Anyone who has been in the Philippines will agree with one of Judge Elliott's conclusions which will be found in his preface to this second volume:

We have changed the face of the country, and given law, order, justice, and equal rights and opportunities to the people, but they are no more Americans to-day than they were two decades ago. . . . A few individuals have been partially Americanized, but it is very doubtful whether we have materially changed the fundamental character of the Filipino people.

But we are tempted to ask why we should try to make Americans out of the Filipinos, and to suggest that American effort has been expended primarily in directions to aid the Filipino to find himself and to learn the great lesson of social control, in order that he may develop along the lines best suited to him.

JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

*Biografía del General José Félix Ribas, Primer Teniente de Bolívar en 1813 y 1814: Época de la Guerra á Muerte.* Por JUAN VICENTE GONZÁLEZ. [Biblioteca Ayacucho.] (Madrid: Editorial-América. [1917.] Pp. 302. 5 pesetas.)

*El Libertador Bolívar y el Deán Funes en la Política Argentina: Revisión de la Historia Argentina.* Por J. FRANCISCO V. SILVA. [Ibid.] (Ibid. [1917.] Pp. 421. 8.50 pesetas.)

LIKE their immediate predecessors, these additions to the *Biblioteca Ayacucho* are works written by historians living long after the persons whose careers they describe. Only in the sense that they deal with events centring about Bolívar and his times do they conform to the original purpose of the series edited by Rufino Blanco-Fombona, which was to reproduce contemporary memoirs. Neither of them is supplied with introduction or comment.

The biography of José Félix Ribas in its present form is a reprint of the edition brought out in Paris in 1913, except that it omits a brief notice of the author and a long prefatory essay by Sr. Blanco-Fombona on Bolívar's proclamation of "war to the death". It appeared originally in a periodical published by González himself at Caracas in 1865. The author was one of the most active polemical writers of his time. Student, satirist, historian, educator, and journalist, eloquent, impetuous, ardent, romantic, and impassioned, one to whom politics was the chief joy in life—he represented well the versatility and the controversial spirit that characterize Spanish-American writers of his own age and of many that were to follow him. The deeds of Ribas certainly furnished his Venezuelan biographer with material that suited his temperament, and the result is an excellent piece of Spanish prose, vigorous and graphic in diction, even if a bit rhetorical and discursive in style.

Ribas was an uncle by marriage of Bolívar, and served as his chief

lieutenant during the campaigns of 1813 and 1814—the period of the “war to the death”—with which the work is mainly concerned. From April 25, 1810, when he was elected a member of the provisional government of Venezuela, his career is described in increasing detail till his tragic death, on January 31, 1815, at the hands of the royalists after the defeat at Maturín. Throughout, the text is enriched with documents and excerpts that impart a contemporary flavor to a narrative itself full of the spirit of the revolution. The appendixes also are of considerable interest. They contain a census of the population of Venezuela in 1809 and 1810, in contrast to that of 1816, prepared by a royalist of the time with the object of showing how frightful had been the work of slaughter done by the rebels; a genealogy of the Ribas family; and a pen-picture of Bolívar at Casacoima in 1817, on the occasion of his famous prophecy about the subsequent course of the struggle for emancipation.

The book on Bolívar and Funes is here printed for the first time. To some extent, indeed, it is a fruit of the publication of the *Biblioteca Ayacucho* itself, for the references to individual volumes in that series are quite frequent. The author, a Cordoban, avails himself of an opportunity to express his disapproval of the headship long exercised by Buenos Aires over Argentina, which he regards as detrimental to the country at large, because of its tendency to “foreignize” the individual provinces. In view of the fact that Gregorio Funes, the celebrated historian, theologian, and pulpit-orator, of whose early career and of whose relations with the Liberator and other eminent men of the age he treats, was rector of the University of Córdoba and dean of the cathedral, he utilizes a description of his life and times as a means of demonstrating the rightfulness of the claim of his native city to consideration as the “true historical capital” of the nation.

In the same connection Sr. Silva undertakes to counteract the hatred for Spain, the dislike for other Spanish-American countries, and the disparagement of Bolívar which official text-books are alleged to have propagated in Argentine schools. This task of “revising Argentine history” he accomplishes in an essay that occupies much less than half the volume. Its tone is violent and the nature of its assertions suggestive of a polemic. The theme, nevertheless, is handled with considerable skill, and its composition shows wide acquaintance with the literature. On his part, the reader will find the essay alike interesting and provocative, because of its challenge to many a preconception about the history of the southern countries of South America.

The bulk of the volume is made up of documents given in appendixes. A few of them, drawn from the national archives and library at Madrid, concern the revolutionary proceedings in the viceroyalty of La Plata between 1810 and 1815, and refer also to the genealogy and professional career of Funes. The majority are taken from the *Memorias* of O’Leary. They consist of letters from Funes to Bolívar, Sucre, O’Leary,

and others between 1824 and 1827. At the close is a communication of recent date from the director of the municipal library of Guayaquil, discussing the famous interview at that city between Bolívar and San Martín.

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

#### MINOR NOTICES

*The Real Business of Living.* By James H. Tufts, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Chicago. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1918, pp. vii, 476, \$1.50.) The author of this book has turned aside from the severer discipline of philosophy to discuss in two hand-books the practical problems of every-day. His first volume, on *Our Democracy, its Origins and Tasks*, antedated the subject of this sketch by a year. It was an historical study for young people of the principles and institutions that naturally belong with democracy. His second book is of the same popular nature. In the author's words it

attempts to show the origins of our institutions and standards, of our business and political ideals. It makes large use of the objective expression of these in law and government, but it also aims to point out the tasks in responsibility, public spirit, fair dealing, city planning, and further development of liberty, co-operation, and democracy which make the real business of living a genuine enterprise of high appeal.

In four parts the author discusses the beginnings of co-operation, order, and liberty, a reprint from the earlier volume; the problems of co-operation and right in business; the problems of life in city and country; and liberty, union, and democracy in the New World. Most of the historical matter is in part I. It deals with social development, especially the reactions of liberty and order. The book has a good index, but few foot-notes and no bibliography.

As a popular treatment of political science and social ethics from the dawn of history up to and beyond present conditions, the book has its place in a time when there is exceptional need of intelligent public opinion. Though it is not a book for scholars, it is of value as an interpretation of the world of the past and the present to American citizens who need to know social and moral values against an historical background.

HENRY K. ROWE.

*Ricerche sulla Storia e sul Diritto Pubblico di Roma.* Serie Terza. *I Fasti dei Tribuni della Plebe e lo Svolgersi della Tribunicia Podestà sino all' Età dei Gracchi.* By Ettore Pais. (Rome, P. Maglione and C. Strini, 1918, pp. xxii, 434. 15 lire.) This book is the third of a series of four volumes planned to supplement the author's *Storia Critica di Roma*. It serves a double purpose. The tribunician lists in it

supplemented by the author's analysis of the *fasti consulares* in its predecessor, furnish us with a chronological basis for the reconstruction of republican history. The second part of the volume gives us the story of the popular movement. The essentially new feature in the method of treating the subject lies in the fact that, both in the lists and in the historical sketch of the tribunate, the material is arranged, as in the Drumann-Groebe *Geschichte Roms*, not chronologically, but from a study of the families which fill the tribunate. This plan of presenting his subject enables the author to take advantage of the well-known fact that the members of a clan were inclined to follow the political traditions of their family, and it brings out the fact that the continued vitality of Rome was due in large measure to the steady infusion of new blood into the governing classes. In his historical sketch Professor Païs also studies the social classes represented by the tribunes, and points out the sections of Italy from which the tribunician families came, and the political tendencies of these families. In the political part of his sketch he discusses the development of the tribunate, its relation to the curule offices, the Gracchan legislation, and the taking over of the tribunician power by Augustus. The volume ends with a chronological list of the tribunes who are known.

*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society.* Third series, volume XI. (London, the Society, 1917, pp. vii, 278.) Whether because the war sets historical folk to thinking, more actively than ever before, as to what is really worth while in history, or for whatever reason, this volume of the Royal Historical Society seems to be devoted, in a rather unusual degree, to subjects of large importance. The presidential address of Professor Firth has for its theme the history of the diplomatic and military relations between Great Britain and Austria, which he treats, though in broad outline, with his customary mastery. Dr. J. Holland Rose gives an excellent account of the Mission of M. Thiers to the Neutral Powers in 1870, Mr. William Foster of the India Board, 1784-1858, its origin, constitution, proceedings, methods, and local habitations. Next is printed a careful and intelligent investigation, by Miss Isobel D. Thornley, of the Treason Legislation of Henry VIII., 1531-1534, *i. e.*, of the causes, circumstances, drafts, amendments, and whole legislative history of the act of 1534, being the Alexander Prize Essay for 1916. Rev. Dr. Henry Gee illustrates the history of sectarian disaffection under the Restoration by a history of the Derwentdale Plot of 1663. An American paper, by Mr. H. P. Biggar, on Charles V. and the Discovery of Canada, places the voyages of Cartier and Roberval in their proper setting, as related to the diplomatic history of the time. Mr. A. F. Sieveking has a less substantial paper on the history of Dueling and Militarism; Rev. Claude Jenkins, librarian of the archiepiscopal library at Lambeth, gives an entertaining survey of the manuscript treasures of that collection.

*An Outline Sketch of English Constitutional History.* By George Burton Adams, Litt.D. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1918, pp. 208, \$1.75.) The abundant literature of English constitutional history is highly specialized, and works of adequate scholarship which cover the whole field are exceedingly few. A volume of such scope written by an historian of the standing of Professor Adams is, therefore, a most welcome contribution. Eleven brief chapters in the author's concise and felicitous essay style deal with as many periods and movements. The aim is specific and practical, namely to trace in outline the steps by which the central government of England has grown from the absolutism of Norman days into its present democratic form. Simplicity of plan and clearness of development are aided by the omission of what is foreign to this purpose. Thus the Tudor period is handled chiefly from the standpoint of the rise of Parliament to importance, and the Star Chamber is mentioned only by way of allusion.

The treatment of feudal institutions and their influence is first to be consulted in whatever Professor Adams writes. In conformity with his well-known views the lesser *curia regis* is defined as a permanent institution in charge of the business of the Norman state, an authority to which all executive and administrative officials were responsible. Liebermann's statement concerning the nature of the great council is traversed by the assertion that a denial of its feudal character because of its superficial resemblance to the Anglo-Saxon assembly denies the feudal character of every institution of the kind in Europe and the Latin Orient. The author's earlier conclusions enable him to hold that the Great Charter is rescued from the limbo of small things to which some would consign it by its insistence, in conformity with the feudal principle of contract, upon the king's subjection to the law.

The essentially novel feature of the work is found in the observations upon the field at large of this veteran student of English constitutional history. The Lancastrian constitution is justly interpreted as the result not of the strength of Parliament but of the weakness of kings. The first two Stuarts misapplied the precedents upon which some of their more important claims rested, but Parliament also strained precedents. Parliament was actually the supreme power from the year 1660. The more important differences between the English constitution and that developing in America after this date are explained by the exclusion from the former of the Puritan experiments. Constitutional liberty probably would not have survived had George III. been successful. The cabinet system is the most important constitutional contribution England has made with the possible exception of limited monarchy and impressive lessons and examples. A change from a monarchy of the British type to a republic would be no gain for democracy. But the retention of monarchy in England has greatly facilitated the spread of democratic institutions throughout the world without the necessity of radical revolution. These few examples may well serve to illustrate the



author's willingness to go to the bottom of a question as well as the thought-provoking quality of his book.

W. A. MORRIS.

*Vue Générale de l'Histoire de Belgique.* Par H. Vander Linden, Professeur à l'Université de Liège. (Paris, Payot et Cie., 1918, pp. 287, 4 fr. 50.) Dedicated to Professors Pirenne and Fredericq, "victims of their opposition to Pan-Germanism", this volume would be sure of a cordial reception by students of history quite apart from the scholarly qualifications of its author. Its sketch of Belgian history from the earliest times to 1914, though brief, is fuller than the *Short History of Belgium* issued by Professor Van der Essen in 1916. The political outline is clear and intelligible, but particular attention is given, after the manner of Pirenne, to economic and social development—the importance of the monasteries in the Carolingian period, the life of the towns, the Burgundian Renaissance, the fortunes of Antwerp, the Catholic revival, modern social problems. The dozen pages devoted to the period since the revolution of 1830 might well have been expanded, at least for the years prior to 1914. As regards the present war and its antecedents, Professor Vander Linden shows the reserve of the true historian in awaiting a longer and less troubled perspective:

We should avoid imitating the historians across the Rhine when they make the great lines of the past converge upon the point of view which the mentality of the moment imposes. . . . History does not lend itself to such a finalization, which suggests only too well the Prussian type of organization.

C. H. H.

*Sumptuary Law in Nürnberg: a Study in Paternal Government.* By Kent Roberts Greenfield, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in Delaware College. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, ser. XXXVI., no. 2.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1918, pp. vi, 7–139, \$1.50.) On the basis of a careful study of the sumptuary legislation of one German city, Professor Greenfield presents certain interesting conclusions. The first of these, and the most emphasized, is that the Reformation had practically nothing to do with the "blue laws". Regulation of all details of private life, afterward fathered on the Puritans, was in reality just as thorough before Luther's time as after it. My own impression is that there is a distinction to be drawn between the Lutheran and Calvinist in this respect. Whereas the Middle Ages tried to regulate amusement, and Luther thoroughly approved of what he enjoyed himself, Calvin once implied that he would abolish gaiety altogether if he could, and the preamble of the famous law closing the English theatres in 1642 seemed to reduce the staple of a Christian's recreation to "seasonable meditation and prayer". The second of Mr. Greenfield's generalizations is that one of

the mainsprings of the paternalism he is studying was the maintenance of class distinctions by a highly aristocratic government; the blue laws, so to speak, were secretions of the blue blood. Thirdly, one notes many ordinances that could have no motive whatever but sheer conservatism—that, for instance, by which citizens were forbidden to part their hair. This tendency to make everyone conform to custom is older than the Middle Ages, and it is only lately that more liberality has prevailed.

Professor Greenfield adds to his main theme sketches of the Nürnberg government and of the advent of the Reformation in that city. As much of the detail of what he presents is new to me, I am unable to assume the omniscient rôle proper to a reviewer and can only thank the author for what I have learned from him.

PRESERVED SMITH.

*A Historical Geography of the British Dependencies. Volume VII. India. Part I. History to the End of the East India Company.* By P. E. Roberts. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1916, pp. iv, 415, 6 sh. 6 d.) This is a singularly uneven book. At times the author does not hesitate to probe traditional verdicts and with sound judgment to revise partizan conclusions. Thus he doubts the strength of the French under Dumas and Duplex, thereby reducing some of the extravagant claims of later British victors. Clive's earlier financial practices are frankly condemned; and the age of graft which followed is well mauled. Warren Hastings receives balanced treatment and the author apparently has some reason to criticize Forrest's earlier ideas on this ugly question. The chapters on Anglo-French rivalry abound in quotation and reference to the best sort of original material. In short here is fresh, vigorous stuff for both student and teacher.

But why does Mr. Roberts give us only one chapter on the life of the English in India and that more than two hundred years ago? There is no clear picture of English domestic administration in the later stages of the Company. Indeed the history of the first half of the nineteenth century, the period of the real and rapid extension of English rule, becomes little more than a list of wars. The dead hand of the Oxford examination manual stretches out when we find that nearly a third of the entire book is given to the latter part of the eighteenth century, and that page after page is thronged with names and dates. The difference is also seen in the use of material, for in chapters on such controversial matters as the First Afghan War and the Mutiny there is scarcely a hint of a document or of first-hand information.

Yet as a whole the book is one of the best single-volume political histories of the English in India to 1858. It is compact, and remarkably free from casual errors. The maps are clear and are not burdened with too much detail, and the index is serviceable. The geography of India is to be treated fully in a separate volume, and we may assume

that another part will deal with the history since 1858. That book is much needed.

ALFRED L. P. DENNIS.

*Shakespeare and the Founders of Liberty in America.* By Charles Mills Gayley, Litt.D., LL.D., Professor of the English Language and Literature in the University of California. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1917, pp. [vii], 270, \$1.50.) This is a war book and the readers of this *Review* will cordially subscribe to its purpose of promoting Anglo-American friendship and to its main argument that the liberties of America, even to our political independence, have been for three centuries encouraged, stimulated, and approved by great Englishmen. The patriots who fought George III. were in no mere figurative sense the intellectual heirs of Sandys, Hooker, and Shakespeare. The historical facts chiefly emphasized in this volume are those made familiar by Alexander Brown, though Professor Gayley seems not to be aware of the extent to which subsequent scholars have felt it necessary to qualify and modify Brown's conclusions. To show that the leaders of the Virginia Company were enlightened statesmen, familiar with radical political speculation, to point to the Virginia House of Burgesses, to the Pierce Patent used by the Pilgrims, to prove Shakespeare's friendship with several of these men and allege his probable knowledge of their colonial schemes, was after all nothing so new to scholars of American or of Stuart history. But Professor Gayley seems not thoroughly aware that something still remained to be demonstrated before Shakespeare could be said to have inspired early American liberty. Many will feel that the untimely end of the Virginia Company throws a heavy burden of proof on those who allege the permanence of the political influence of Sandys in Virginia, while the prompt severance of relations with the Virginia Company by the Pilgrims (who, we can be quite sure, did not derive their plans for emigration from Sandys) and the well-known aversion at Plymouth and Boston throughout the seventeenth century for all plays or actors, weakens the presumption of any direct influence of Shakespeare upon early New England. Is it not perhaps as necessary to show that the first men and women to settle in America knew and admired Shakespeare as to prove that Shakespeare knew and appreciated the capitalists concerned with the first colonial ventures? Ought not some weight to be attached to the poet's retirement in 1611 and to his death in 1616, some years before the stirring events of 1619-1621? Professor Gayley's book emphasizes a useful fact, but we could wish that his volume were either less technical and involved and better fitted for popular consumption, or more accurately technical in substance and in its *apparatus criticus*.

ROLAND G. USHER.

*Women and the French Tradition.* By Florence Leftwich Ravenel. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1918, pp. ix, 234, \$1.50.) In the

essays here presented, most of which have appeared in the *North American Review*, Mrs. Ravenel attempts, by means of studies of a few notable French women, to estimate the contribution which French women have made to the present position and achievements of women. The preliminary essay, the *Eternal Feminine*, reprinted from the *Unpopular Review*, gives a brief and superficial survey of the position of women in America, England, and France. This is followed by sketches of Arvède Barine, George Sand, Mme. de Staël, Mme. de Sévigné, Mme. de Lafayette, and the daughters of three of these women—sketches slight in substance but sympathetic and graceful in form. The volume closes with a general estimate of the work and the aspirations of the women of France.

*Materialy dlia Istorii Gangutskoi Operatsii.* Volume I., parts 1 and 2. (Petrograd, 1914 [1918], pp. xxxvi, 138, 276.) On July 27 (O. S.), 1714, a small Russian naval force attacked and defeated an equally small force of the Swedish fleet. The fight took place in the Baltic Sea not far from Gange Cape (Hangö Udd), hence the Russian name of the battle, "Gangutskoi Boi". The victory decided nothing of importance, but Peter, who participated in the fight and because of it had himself promoted to the rank of vice-admiral, regarded it as Russia's first naval victory.

In honor of the event the Russian government desired to commemorate the two-hundredth anniversary in some appropriate manner. After some discussion the commission in charge of the celebration decided to collect and publish all the material bearing on the subject which is to be found in Russia and Sweden. Capt. Alexander I. Lebedev, the able director of the Russian naval archives, was made chairman of a committee to do this work, and with him were associated Lieutenants G. A. Kniazev and S. M. Shcheglov, both of whom are university men well trained in historical research. They have planned a work in six volumes: (I.) letters and orders of Peter during the years 1713 and 1714; (II.) reports and letters to Peter and to Charles XII.; (III.) journals of Apraksin, Siniavin, Shuvalov, and the Swedish admiral Vattrang; (IV.) correspondence of Apraksin, Menshikov, Golovkin, Dolgorukov, and others; (V.) names of the officers and men who took part in the fight; popular accounts of the battle, etc.; (VI.) subject and name index.

When the work was undertaken it was hoped to have it completed in 1914 or 1915, but owing to the war no more than two volumes have been published, and only volume I. has reached this country. This book is edited in a careful and scholarly manner. Its contents however have little that is of general interest.

*La Morale Politique du Grand Frédéric d'après sa Correspondance.* Par Commandant Weil. (Paris, Plon-Nourrit et Cie., 1917, pp. 586.) Under the inspiration of the late Dr. Reinhold Koser, the Prussian

government has been publishing Frederick the Great's political correspondence, and at the beginning of the war had already issued some thirty-five volumes reaching through the First Partition of Poland. It is a most valuable source of information, not only for our knowledge of the king's character and policy, but also for the diplomatic history of Europe from 1740 onwards. Commandant Weil has reprinted the more important letters and orders from this correspondence for the period covering the first months of the king's reign and the first Silesian War. He has added an interesting introduction and valuable explanatory notes to each letter, which reveal more clearly than before Frederick the Great's total lack of political morality. His Machiavellian dealings stand out in absolute contrast to the pious precepts which he had set forth a few months before in *L'Antimachiavel*. M. Weil's volume sharpens the light on Frederick's dark doings rather than makes known any new facts.

S. B. F.

*La Révolution et les Étrangers: Cosmopolitisme et Défense Nationale.* Par Albert Mathiez, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Besançon. (Paris, Renaissance du Livre, 1918, pp. 191, 2 fr. 50.) This little book was suggested to the author by the similarities and the contrasts between the treatment of foreigners, and especially of enemy aliens, during the French revolutionary wars and in the present struggle. The similarities naturally first attract the attention. The spy mania was as widespread in 1793 as in any of the warring countries to-day. Pitt's agents were seen everywhere. They were held responsible for the depreciation of the assignats, for the scarcity of food, and for all the other ills of the time. If fires broke out in Douai or Valenciennes, in a sail-loft at Lorient, a cartridge factory at Bayonne, or an artillery depot at Chemillé, these events were due to British spies or British gold. The Convention denounced "au nom de l'humanité outragée, à tous les peuples et même au peuple anglais, la conduite lâche, perfide et atroce du gouvernement britannique qui soudoie l'assassinat, le poison, l'incendie et tous les crimes pour le triomphe de la tyrannie et pour l'anéantissement des droits de l'homme".

The contrasts between the two periods are equally striking. Professor Mathiez tells the story of the hesitations of the Convention in abandoning the earlier attitude of cosmopolitanism, with its naïve confidence that the message of the Revolution would be heard by all peoples. Indeed, the laws for the restraint of aliens did not reach their full development until the spring of 1794. The severest measures were directed against the English and included the sequestration of their property. This body of law was, however, far less rigorous than the measures taken in France at the opening of the present war.

The first chapters of the book describe the reception of the news of the Revolution in foreign lands, the pilgrimages of notable men to Paris,

and the movement to admit to French citizenship the benefactors of humanity, to whatever nation they might belong. The later chapters deal not only with the decline of cosmopolitanism before the exigencies of the national defense, but also present much interesting information about individual foreigners who remained in Paris after the crisis of 1793 opened, and to several of whom Professor Mathiez applies a term not unfamiliar in America—"les indésirables".

Professor Mathiez displays a scant generosity in writing of the foreigners whose enthusiasm for the Revolution was chilled by the news of the Massacres of September, the execution of Louis XVI., and the war of propaganda and annexation. He appears to believe that most of them were timid souls, frightened by the menacing attitude of their own governments. Incidentally he condones the Reign of Terror, remarking that it "ne fût pas autre chose que ce que nous désignons aujourd'hui sous le nom d'état de siège". Surely he does not believe that modern French courts are capable of the systematic injustices of the Revolutionary Tribunal or that French officials could now order "fusillades" and "noyades". It was by the Revolutionary Tribunal and the committees which furnished Fouquier-Tinville with victims, that certain foreigners were unjustly treated, although they were done to death not as foreigners but as members of factions which the Committee of Public Safety found dangerous, or simply irritating.

H. E. BOURNE.

*The French Assembly of 1848 and American Constitutional Doctrines.* By Eugene Newton Curtis, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Modern European History in Goucher College. (New York, Columbia University, 1918, pp. 357, \$3.00.) The author of this study has shown a highly commendable enthusiasm in search for materials, a grim determination not to omit anything which has even the remotest bearing on his subject, and a zeal for scientific method which requires that every process of investigation be exhibited in the most minute detail. The result is a bulky volume of undoubted merit. But, in the opinion of the reviewer, the book would have been of greater value if compressed into half or even a third of the space which has been used.

At Paris the author got access to the unpublished *procès-verbaux* of the constitutional commission of the National Assembly of 1848, hitherto little used, a large number of newspapers, and a good many contemporaneous collections of constitutions and pamphlets not to be found elsewhere.

The first four chapters constitute an elaborate introduction to the real subject of the study, which is found in chapters V. and VI. This introduction includes a contrast between France and the United States in 1848, an account of the recognition of the Second Republic by the United States and its reception in France, an analysis of the few books from which the educated French public of 1848 drew its ideas of the



United States, and a minute examination of the composition, organization, and party alignment of the National Assembly. Much of this, while valuable for the history of the Second Republic, has no close relation to the subject of the book. A good many pages are given up to biographical data, only a small part of which has any real significance for this study.

In chapters V. and VI. the debates in the constitutional commission and the assembly are examined minutely for the purpose of detecting every trace of the influence of American constitutional doctrines. The thoroughness of the examination is beyond all reproach. Readers will readily believe that no allusion has escaped the vigilance of the author. A much more definite impression would have been left if a good many of the less significant allusions had been omitted, if the author had followed some precise formula for determining what makes a constitutional doctrine, and if he had confined his reports of speeches to the parts of the really significant ones which discussed or showed traces of American constitutional influences. The author seems frequently to forget that his subject is of limited scope.

The last two chapters contain an almost equally minute study of the newspaper and review articles, pamphlets, and books published in France during 1848 in which American ideas were discussed, and formulate the results of the study. Professor Curtis concludes that the influence exerted by American precedent on the liberal republicans who controlled the assembly was slight. References to American example were numerous, there was a good deal of debate upon the merit of and reasons for certain features in the American Constitution, but the assembly was not greatly influenced thereby. American precedent was not thought applicable to France.

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

*Italy's Great War and Her National Aspirations.* (Milan, Alfieri and Lacroix, 1917, pp. 267.) This is a small volume with excellent illustrations and four maps, to which Mr. H. Nelson Gay contributes an introductory chapter, and of which the other chapters have been prepared respectively by Signor Mario Alberti, Gen. Carlo Corsi, Signori Armando Hodnig, Tomaso Sillani, Attilio Tamaro, and Ettore Tolomei. The successive chapters cover the history of the relations between Austria and Italy since 1814, emphasizing the course of Austrian domination in Italy and relating the Italian martyrology of the unredeemed provinces since 1866; the general reasons, ideal and political, for the entrance of Italy into the war; the special conditions, historical and political, of the provinces which are claimed by the Irredentist programme—the Trentino, eastern Friuli, Trieste, Istria, Fiume, and Dalmatia; the Italian successes on land and sea; the Italian demonstrations of economic and financial strength. There is much good information in the book, though its tone is, naturally, not devoid of partizanship. In this country it is sold by the Houghton Mifflin Company.



*Cartas de China: Documentos Inéditos sobre Misiones Franciscanas del Siglo XVII.* Publicalos por primera vez el P. Otto Maas, O. F. M. (Seville, Est. Tip. de J. Santigosa, 1917, pp. vii, 190.) *Cartas de China (Segunda Serie): Documentos Inéditos sobre Misiones de los Siglos XVII. y XVIII.* (Seville, Izquierdo y Compañía, 1917, pp. viii, 221.) The publication of these two collections of missionary letters from Franciscans in the Far East has been the editor's labor of love and research among the archives of convents in Guadalajara. The first volume contains twenty-seven letters from Antonio de Santa Maria written from places in North China during the middle decade of the seventeenth century to the provincial and others in Manila, and eleven letters from Augustin de San Pascual, dating from 1677 to 1688. The second volume has three series of letters from Bernardo de la Encarnación, Pedro de la Piñuela, and Jaime Tarín, all in China, covering the last quarter of the same century. To these are added fifteen appendixes giving data on the Catholic missions in the East, including the text of Innocent XII's (1696) brief establishing the first apostolic vicarates in China. Typical reports of the state of the missions of the four orders as presented to the *almirante de galeones* at Manila in the year 1688 are interesting. Most of the manuscripts in this collection are found in the archives of the Franciscan provincial of San Gregorio de Filipinas in the convent of Pastrana, which, with other conventual libraries of Spain, preserve an enormous amount of untouched material bearing on the propaganda in China. Among others the editor refers to "un gran volumen manuscrito intitulado Historia de la Provincia de San Gregorio in China, 1711", which ought to be published. The seventeenth century was one of great hardship and defeat for the brave missionaries in China, who had to endure the repressive policy of the Manchu dynasty as well as the bitter quarrel of the Jesuits with the rival orders in matters of prerogative and policy. The substance of the letters here presented may be useful to students of the stormy period of the Manchu conquest, but the fathers were not so well informed of either political conditions or military operations as to render their reports of great consequence to the historian. Their main value lies naturally in the fresh data offered for the study of Franciscan missionary operations in China. The editor adds a brief but substantial historical introduction and a few notes.

F. W. WILLIAMS.

*The Development of Japan.* By Kenneth Scott Latourette, Professor of History in Denison University. Published under the auspices of the Japan Society. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1918, pp. xi, 237, \$1.50.) Professor Latourette felt the need of a text-book to cover a six weeks' course in Japanese history and he has placed many people under obligation to him by seeking "to fill the gap until something better shall appear". He has succeeded remarkably well. In a volume of

224 pages he has given us the best brief history of Japan with which the reviewer is familiar. Several commendable features stand out at once. First, is the spirit of the author. He has never forgotten that he is describing the achievements of the Japanese and hence he has not made it his first duty to hold up to them constantly the yardstick of European advancement. Again, the proportions are good. Almost half the volume deals with old Japan, and the remainder with the events since the re-opening of the country, for "the Japan of 1917 is so decidedly the child of the Japan of 1850 that to know the first one must be acquainted with the second". His manner of presentation is excellent. The story is told clearly and well, and with unusual discrimination in the use of words, so that a single sentence often furnishes a better summary than many paragraphs. For instance, in speaking of the constitution of the empire, "although conservative, it is so elastic that its real working may change with the political education of the people, and still retain its form", which may be commended to several recent writers on this subject. The two-page description of Buddhism is an excellent example of clear condensation. And in spite of space limitations he has been able to say a word about the religious, social, cultural, and political life of the people in each of the great periods, naturally at the expense of detailed treatment of military operations. The political history of Japan since 1891 is summarized in a brief but effective manner.

At the end of each chapter are brief lists of books for further reading, and a small bibliography, partly critical, is appended. Brief as it is, it should have included the two masterly histories of James Murdoch, which, however, because published in Japan, may not be easily available for school libraries in this country.

The book is remarkably free from textual errors. "Araga" (p. 108) should be Uruga, "1869" (p. 130) should be 1868, and "1868" (p. 152) should be 1858.

PAYSON J. TREAT.

*Japan: the Rise of a Modern Power.* By Robert P. Porter. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1918, pp. xi, 361, \$2.25.) The late Robert P. Porter was for many years an American journalist and public servant, notably as director of the Eleventh Census. During the later years of his life he was on the staff of the *Times* (London) and resided in England. The present volume was published after his death. In this field he had already issued *The Commerce and Industry of Japan* and *The Full Recognition of Japan*. The purpose of the present little volume was "to describe, for English-speaking people, the main facts of Japanese history".

The volume is divided into two parts. Part I. (pp. 262) is a brief survey of Japanese history from the earliest times to the capture of Tsing-tao in 1914. Ninety-eight pages treat of the period before the arrival of Commodore Perry, in 1853, and the rest deal with the subse-

quent sixty-one years. This lack of proportion, of course, defeats the purpose of the author, for, instead of giving "the main facts of Japanese history", he has emphasized the period of modern Japan. Even a casual reader should know more about the history of Japan, to 1542, than the twenty-seven and a quarter pages allotted to the period by Mr. Porter. On the other hand fifty pages are devoted to the military operations of the Russo-Japanese War.

The story, however, is pleasantly told, with the skill of the trained writer. One very interesting and helpful feature is the frequent correlation of events in Japan with contemporary happenings in the West, and Japanese and Western heroes are constantly linked in comment. Thus Nobunaga was born in the year after Queen Elizabeth, Hideyoshi is spoken of as "the Japanese Cromwell", and "the Pharaohs, Diocletian, the Byzantine emperors, and Louis XIV. never framed more effective measures for securing their power than Iyeyasu's". These allusions, and there are many of them, keep one in mind of the fact that the Japanese live on the same planet with ourselves and have undergone about the same human experiences. Another interesting feature is the reaction of the author's mind to the present war. Thus, the Kaiser "invited the Tsar to take Port Arthur and Ta-lien-wan", in 1898, for that would precipitate a Russo-Japanese war which would allow Germany and Austria to crush France (pp. 145-146). Furthermore, in order to keep France from assisting Russia in the coming struggle, Germany suggested the Anglo-Japanese alliance, which would cause France to keep her fleet in European waters, and also would permanently estrange Russia from Great Britain (pp. 152-153). In the historical chapters a few dates are wrongly given, and Mr. Porter twice speaks of the "ultimatum" delivered by Commodore Perry.

Part II. (pp. 85) is a brief account of certain features of Japanese civilization and progress, with chapters on physical characteristics, resources and industrial progress, trade and internal communications, evolution of the army and navy, and literature and art. Here again we have an excellent example of brief and suggestive statement.

PAYSON J. TREAT.

*A History of the Tariff Relations of the Australian Colonies.* By Cephas Daniel Allin, M.A., LL.B., Professor of Political Science in the University of Minnesota. [University of Minnesota Studies in the Social Sciences, no. VII.] (Minneapolis, the University, 1918, pp. vi. 177, 75 cents.) Professor Allin presents a study of the tariff relations between the Australian colonies from 1840 to 1865. This volume supplements a monograph on the *Early Federation Movement of Australia*, and it is the expressed intent to publish a third on "intercolonial preferential trade".

The writer states in the preface that the purpose of his study was to discover what part fiscal relations "played in provincial politics and

what effect they had upon the development of the spirit of Australian nationalism". In the introduction he gives an evaluation of the results of the investigation:

To the statesman or political scientist, the tariff history of this period is of small practical or scientific value. It is a record which is concerned almost exclusively with insignificant matters of purely local interest. It has no general economic significance. It has exerted but little influence upon the course of imperial or Australian politics.

A reading of the volume reveals facts that are of considerable political and economic value. Professor Allin shows how the Secretary of State for the Colonies failed to regulate the intercolonial fiscal relations. Tariff autonomy came in 1850, and each colony fixed its own duties. Later, the discovery of gold opened the interior of the continent to trade. Another important event, but less dramatic, was the settlement of the Murray River valley, which led to the development of an inland trade over the colonial boundaries. The gold mines and the settlements enhanced the value of the hinterland to the rival business interests of Melbourne, Sydney, and Adelaide.

Gradually the miners, the cattle men, and the settlers made themselves heard. Leaders like E. Deas Thompson and R. R. Torrens began to preach the economic unity of the Australias. The *Sydney Herald* supported tariff assimilation. The chambers of commerce realized the futility of the tariff as a competitive weapon even before the legislators did. In 1855 New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia agreed to abandon border custom-houses and to permit unrestricted free trade across the Murray. But they did not come to a settlement about the duties on sea-borne trade. At the Melbourne conference, 1863, the colonies agreed upon a uniform tariff, with exceptions, and upon a plan for distributing the revenues collected thereunder. However, the execution of this plan failed.

Professor Allin has made good use of legislative documents, but there is a noticeable lack of reference to material bearing on the operation of economic forces, which, after all, furnish the motive power for tariff legislation.

CHARLES E. HILL.

*The Principles of American Diplomacy.* By John Bassett Moore, LL.D., Professor of International Law and Diplomacy in Columbia University. [Harper's Citizen's Series, edited by William F. Willoughby.] (New York and London, Harper and Brothers, 1918, pp. xiv, 477, \$2.00.) In view of the author's eminence, it may be permissible to allow him to speak *in persona* of the character and purpose of this book.

The present work incorporates substantially the entire text, with few alterations or amendments, of the volume published by the author in 1905 under the title *American Diplomacy: its Spirit and Achievements*. The narrative in that volume, however, embraces few incidents that oc-

curred later than 1903. The years that have elapsed have been marked by important events, some of which are destined to be highly influential in shaping the future course of the foreign policy of the United States. The present work brings the history of that policy down to date. The object of the author in the preparation of the original work, as well as in its revision, has been to set forth and explain the fundamental principles by which the diplomacy of the United States has been governed (p. vii).

This purpose is admirably accomplished. In successive chapters, including such subjects as the System of Neutrality, Freedom of the Seas, Commercial Restrictions, Non-Intervention and the Monroe Doctrine, the Doctrine of Expatriation, International Arbitration, Pan-Americanism, etc., each principle is treated in chronological order and in its proper setting or relation to the others.

The chapter on neutrality includes a good summary of the diplomatic events leading up to our entry into the Great War. There is also an excellent view of our recent policy in Mexico in the chapter on the Monroe Doctrine. These are perhaps the most interesting and important additions to the former volume, except for the chapter on Pan-Americanism, which is wholly new.

We must confess to one disappointment in reading this volume. We had hoped to discover more of the personal opinions or impressions of the author, who is not only one of the profoundest and most learned of our publicists, but who must have been in the position of a first-hand observer of some of the events which he relates. It may be possible here and there to read between the lines, as, for example, where he seems to give his sanction to the view that "the true test of a government's title to recognition is not the theoretical legitimacy of its origin, but the fact of its existence as the apparent exponent of the popular will" (p. 209). We have noted but one instance of the kind, where he "ventures to express the opinion that the problem [of dealing with the Philippine Islands] was simplified by taking all the islands" (p. 354).

At the end of each chapter there are lists of references or citations from the sources, which enable the student to make a further study of the subjects treated. The volume is provided with a valuable bibliography and a good index.

AMOS S. HERSHEY.

*Miscellaneous Addresses.* By Elihu Root. Collected and edited by Robert Bacon and James Brown Scott. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1917, pp. ix, 313, \$2.50.) The forty-odd addresses in this volume, dealing with subjects as diverse as the Object of Columbia University and the Monroe Doctrine, Joseph G. Cannon and the Iroquois Indians, are naturally of very diverse value. Some of the personal sketches, notably that of John Hay (p. 91 ff.), will be of direct use to the historian. Others, like the one delivered on the centennial celebra-

tion of Mr. Root's *alma mater*, make a narrower appeal. Several might well have been omitted.

Mr. Root sketches himself for us in these pages rather interestingly. In outlook he is the average American of New England descent endowed with brains and helped on by a legal training and a successful career. By resolution he is an optimist but not altogether so by conviction. He admits that there has been progress: "Never in the world have there been so many people so free from the hard restraints of poverty . . . so many people able to perform the duties of good citizenship" (p. 138). Yet one result of prosperity is increasing class jealousy (p. 124), and meanwhile, the old wholesome individualism has passed away; "Interdependence of life has taken the place of self-dependence" (p. 149).

Mr. Root's style is that of the high-class specialist, and a bit unbending for popular uses, but he masses facts impressively, and can be refreshingly frank. He questions if the farmers have ever really benefited from the tariff on their products (p. 176). He records that "When we elected McKinley in 1896 and again in 1900, it was the business men of the United States who controlled the election" (p. 250). In 1904, in addressing the Union League Club of New York, he paid Theodore Roosevelt this oblique compliment: "But I say to you that he has been, during these years since President McKinley's death, the greatest conservative force for the protection of property and our institutions in the city of Washington" (p. 222).

It is in the field of international politics that Mr. Root's democracy appears to best advantage, and indeed the relation between the triumph of political democracy and the maintenance of international law has been nowhere stated more judiciously than in his notable address of April 26, 1917 (p. 280 ff.). Eleven years earlier he had touched prophetically upon another phase of our participation in the war. "Know", said he to the French ambassador at Philadelphia, "that we have in America a sentiment for France; and a sentiment enduring among a people is a great and substantial fact to be reckoned with" (p. 142). Another instance of the "imponderables" of which Bismarck warned his countrymen so unavailingly!

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

*Doctrinal Standards of Methodism, including the Methodist Episcopal Churches.* By Thomas Benjamin Neely, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. (New York, Fleming H. Revell Company, 1918, pp. 355, \$2.00.) Bishop Neely is here presenting in somewhat popular form the tenets of Methodist faith as it stands to-day, with some idea of their historical evolution and of their place in the history of the church. His review of the early growth of the faith of the Christian Church is most summary and is confined almost entirely to external matters, such as the names of various creeds and the dates



of their adoption, concerning itself not at all with the changing philosophies underlying these restatements of the belief of Christendom. From the time of the Reformation on, the historic facts relating to doctrine are presented with more fullness, a fullness naturally most noticeable in the case of Wesley. The evolution of distinctly Methodist doctrine largely accomplished by Wesley is expounded by means of reference to Wesley's own writings. From the historical point of view, probably the most interesting chapter is that entitled Early American Methodism and its Doctrines, in which the crystallization of Wesley's belief into the formal creed of a well-organized church is described. The underlying purpose of the book is to show that Wesley himself possessed a definite and essential set of doctrines, that these doctrines were accepted by his followers, were recognized and embodied in the articles of faith of the Methodist Church, and are to-day an essential element of Methodism. The audience addressed is the body of members of the Methodist Church in its various branches.

*Jasper Mauduit, Agent in London for the Province of the Massachusetts Bay, 1762-1765.* [Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, vol. LXXIV.] (Boston, the Society, 1918, pp. xxxvii, 194.) The publication of the Jasper Mauduit correspondence by the Massachusetts Historical Society constitutes a useful addition to the small but increasing body of material from which an adequate account of the colonial agency will some day be written. Letters of Ashurst, Paris, Wilks, Sharpe, Kilby, Partridge, De Berdt, Franklin, Abercrombie, McCulloch, Ingersoll, Cumberland, Life, Jackson and others exist in one form or another and a considerable collection of Charles Garth papers can be found in Washington and London. Were a list made, it is likely that one or more letters of practically all the agents of the colonies, West Indian and continental, could be discovered, either here or in England, and, when brought together, such a collection would constitute a record of activities of high importance for Great Britain's relations with her colonies. The correspondence here printed is made up in largest part of letters written to Mauduit by various correspondents and is of undoubted value, though I must confess to a measure of disappointment in finding so little of importance on the fundamental issue of the period. The letters were purchased at auction in London by Mr. Charles G. Washburn, who presented them to the Massachusetts Historical Society and provided funds for their publication. They are here edited by Mr. Ford, with all the skill of his craft, while Mr. Washburn has contributed an excellent introduction. The time would seem to be ripe for an enlargement of the subject of the agency as treated by Professor Tanner some years ago.

C. M. A.



*The Public Life of Zachariah Chandler, 1851-1875.* By Wilmer C. Harris, Ph.D. [Michigan Historical Publications, University Series, II.] (Lansing, Historical Commission, 1917, pp. 152, \$1.00.) This is a plain account of the public career of Zach. Chandler, the noted Republican political leader of Michigan, from his election as mayor of Detroit in 1851 to his sudden death while a senator of the United States in 1879. These years marked stirring times, during which Chandler was engaged in much party activity and in many political controversies. Dr. Harris in his brief monographic sketch is able to touch only lightly on varied subjects of much historical importance. The monograph is intended to supplement, not to supersede, the *Post and Tribune Life of Chandler*, which was written from partial and friendly motives. Dr. Harris writes without bias or partizanship and is far from being a eulogist. He merely sets forth, with very little of either commendation or disapproval, the party record of Chandler and his position on public policies. We see Chandler as an early Whig candidate for governor of Michigan in 1852; as one of the founders of the Republican party in 1854; as the successor of Lewis Cass in the Senate in 1857; as a Radical Republican in that body during Civil War and Reconstruction times, till his defeat for re-election in 1875; as Secretary of the Interior for a time under President Grant; as chairman of the Republican National Committee in 1876; and again as United States senator to fill an unexpired term.

The author finds in Chandler a "typical product of his time", a "fire-eater of the Northwest", and an "exponent of practical spoils politics", one who was a political manager of great strength, who never hesitated to build and use a party machine in order to promote his own political ambition and to keep himself in power. The kind of radical that Chandler was before the war is shown by his being ever ready to meet Southern threats of disunion with counter-threats of hanging rebels, and by his proposal to his Republican colleagues to stand up in the face of Southern insults with bold challenges to fight—"to carry the quarrel into a coffin". He knew no compromise. If the right of secession were to be conceded, or if the South had to be "let alone" to break up the Union, he wished to know it. Then Chandler would resign his seat in the Senate, arrange his business affairs, and prepare to migrate, as he proposed never to live in a country whose government "had no power to enforce its own laws". He preferred to join the Comanche Indians. His famous letter about "stiff-backed men" and a little "blood-letting" as a cement to the Union finds its due recognition in the essay.

One is disappointed to find that only a very few lines are given to Mr. Chandler's connection with the campaign and disputed election of 1876, when the cause of "a civil service reform candidate was managed by a dyed-in-the-wool spoilsman". Chandler's telegram is given, announcing Hayes's election with 185 electoral votes, but nothing is told

of what Chandler did in the winter of 1876-1877 to make that famous telegram good. It is so with many other subjects of importance; everything is brief, sometimes to the point of leaving one quite unsatisfied. However, such defects are incident to the nature of the task. The volume, on the whole, is a credit to the author and it is one of distinct value to the student of American politics. It contains a good deal of Michigan political history. Valuable material is presented from Chandler's letters, and an informing chapter on the racial and religious elements in Michigan's voting on historic issues. The volume has a good index and a full bibliography.

J. A. W.

*Separation of State and Local Revenues in the United States.* By Mabel Newcomer, Ph.D., Instructor in Economics, Vassar College. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, edited by the Faculty of Columbia University, vol. LXXVI., no. 2, whole no. 180.] (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1917, pp. 295, \$1.75.) One of the well-marked tendencies in the history of the finances of our state governments during the last forty years has been the development of sources of state revenue other than additions to the locally assessed general property tax. Dr. Newcomer has traced the course of this development in eight of the states in which it has been most marked and has endeavored to estimate its effects. The facts which she brings out seem to justify her conclusion that, while it has yielded a substantial benefit by opening up new sources of revenue, diminishing the burden of taxation on real estate, which supplies practically the whole of the locally assessed general property tax, thereby distributing the burden of taxation more equitably, separation has accomplished little in the way of improving local tax administration, such progress as has been made in this field being due to other causes, and has failed as yet to provide a satisfactory system of state taxation. Especially has it failed to furnish an elastic element in the state revenues, with the result that three of the states which had succeeded in attaining complete separation have been again compelled to resort to the general property tax. One reason is that, with the exception of California, the system of separation represents not the result of carefully studied plans but the accumulation of more or less unrelated measures passed from time to time to meet the need for additional revenue or in response to criticisms of special features of the existing system which had succeeded in attracting public attention. On the other hand, there is no evidence that separation can justly be charged with some of the evils—wasteful and extravagant expenditure, decreased efficiency in the administration of the general property tax due to the fact that the state would no longer be interested in it—which its opponents feared.

The problem of a just and effective system of state and local taxation still remains. The development of separate sources of state revenue is a step in progress but it has not effected a solution.

The studies of the states treated in detail are apparently accurate and adequate for the purpose in view. In her statements on pages 24 and 25, however, the author exaggerates the completeness of separation in England and Germany, while in the brief chapter on the general movement in this country she understates the extent of separation, a result of taking the census figures at their face value.

H. B. G.

*Publications of the Buffalo Historical Society.* Edited by Frank H. Severance. Volume XXII. (Buffalo, the Society, 1918, pp. ix, 437.) Probably no city in the country is more fortunate as to the manner in which its local history is being preserved than is Buffalo, where an energetic historical society, under the guidance of Mr. Frank Severance, is producing a useful and attractive series of volumes. The present number contains, among a miscellaneous collection, two articles of special merit. The first of these, the History of the University of Buffalo, 1846-1917, by Julian Park, secretary of the department of arts and sciences in the university, is a careful study of a pioneer among municipal universities in this country. Hon. Henry W. Hill contributes an Historical Sketch of Niagara Ship Canal Projects, covering the ground from 1710, when an agent of the French government reported the connecting of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario to be a most expensive project of doubtful value, to April 25, 1917, when the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce advised against a ship canal connecting the two lakes. Among the less important articles there is an interesting account of the celebration of the centenary of the beginning of the Erie Canal, containing an address on the Evolution of the New York Canal System, by Hon. George Clinton. The secretary, Mr. Severance, contributes a chapter of Indian history, Our Tuscarora Neighbors; Mrs. Frank J. Shepard presents a compilation of material on the Women's Educational and Industrial Union; and the proceedings of the society in its last three annual meetings, 1916, 1917, and 1918, are presented.

*The Anti-Slavery Movement in Kentucky prior to 1850.* By Asa Earl Martin, Assistant Professor of American History in the Pennsylvania State College. [Filson Club Publication, no. 29.] (Louisville, Filson Club, 1918, pp. 165.) Related by soil and climate to its neighbors across the Ohio, bound to Virginia as the main source of its population and institutions, and drawn to the newer Southern states as its chief market, Kentucky in the first half of the nineteenth century was the ground on which the interests of sections met and clashed.

Mr. Martin barely hints at this larger significance of his subject, as on page 144, but discusses many phases of the anti-slavery movement from the strictly local point of view. His most important contribution is the treatment of the movement for gradual emancipation. Abolition, he concludes, found little favor in Kentucky, while gradual emancipa-

tion enlisted strong support, including members of both political parties and many slave-holders. The movement derived its impulse from the conviction that slavery was both a moral evil and a positive obstacle to the material progress of the state. In shaping a practical programme it proved weak. The climax came in the effort to secure in the constitution of 1849 a provision permitting the adoption of any plan which might later be decided upon. Instead, the new frame of government forbade emancipation save where the freedman could be removed from the state. The net result of the half-century of conflict was a greater freedom of discussion than was allowed elsewhere in the slave states.

The writer's research in printed materials and in the manuscript collections of the libraries of Congress, the University of Chicago, and the Wisconsin State Historical Society, has brought together the data for an illuminating discussion, but he has not handled his matter in a very happy manner. In particular his synthesis lacks all dramatic quality and is illogical and confusing. The final chapter, entitled "Conclusions" (in reality an abstract of the work), clarifies the situation in some degree.

HOMER C. HOCKETT.

*Marches of the Dragoons in the Mississippi Valley: an Account of Marches and Activities of the First Regiment United States Dragoons in the Mississippi Valley between the Years 1833 and 1850.* By Louis Pelzer. (Iowa City, State Historical Society of Iowa, 1917, pp. x, 282, \$2.50.) It was an excellent idea to show concretely and in detail how the peaceful development of our western territory was promoted by a portion of our army, and the interesting story reflects credit not only upon the government but upon the officers of the First Dragoons—such men as Dodge, Kearny, Sumner, and Cooke. The title of the book, however, scarcely does it justice either in time or in space, for the history begins before 1833 and extends not only to the valley of the Rio Grande but to the Pacific. First we have a brief study of the army in 1830. To the causes of desertion here pointed out the author might have added another: the unfeeling manner in which some of the officers fresh from West Point asserted their authority. Then follow in successive chapters good accounts of the erection of forts, the building of roads, marches to explore or scout, negotiations with the Indians, the protection of the Santa Fé trade, the conquest of New Mexico, and Kearny's expedition to California. In connection with these and some other topics, information is given regarding life on the frontier and the conditions prevailing there. The narrative is based mainly upon first-hand sources, and as a rule these have been used with commendable care; but the existing material has not been exhausted, and occasionally one meets with a statement that is open to criticism. For example, on page 142 we are told that the United States declared war against Mexico, May 12, 1846, whereas we merely recognized a state of war as

already existing, and did this on May 13. In a few places the narrative lacks clarity, except for those who know something the author does not tell them.

JUSTIN H. SMITH.

*The Illinois and Michigan Canal: a Study in Economic History.* By James William Putnam, Ph.D., Professor of Economics in Butler College. [Chicago Historical Society Collection, vol. X. Illinois Centennial Publication.] (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1918, pp. xiii, 213, \$2.00.) The appearance of Professor Putnam's *Economic History of the Illinois and Michigan Canal* in a new dress is timely as well as important: timely because of the approaching celebration of the Illinois state centennial, important because of the influence which such an excellent piece of research is likely to have on those local historians whose zeal invariably outruns their desire and ability to give careful attention to details. As its title indicates, this little volume lays particular stress on the economic aspects of the canal. It goes even beyond that; it pictures the whole problem of canal-building which the states of Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio undertook to solve during the thirties and forties.

In five chapters, comprising 154 pages, the author treats with sufficient detail the building, the operation, and the economic effects of the canal. He devotes one chapter to the project itself, a second to actual construction, a third to management, a fourth to its economic influences, and a fifth to improvement and enlargement. A sixth chapter comprises a concise summary as well as several significant conclusions. In addition to the text proper there are several appendixes, an unclassified bibliography, seven illustrations, and a satisfactory index. The foot-notes and references are numerous and well chosen, and they will undoubtedly prove to be of great value to students of Illinois history.

One serious oversight by the author must be noticed. Apparently he has overlooked the voluminous correspondence concerning the canal and the canal debt which is printed in volume VII. of the *Illinois Historical Collections*. Otherwise he would not have confused the payment of interest on the state debt with the creation of a new canal board (p. 52, no. 2). Newspaper sources, too, could have been used to a better advantage.

C. M. THOMPSON.

*Old Fort Snelling, 1819-1858.* By Marcus L. Hansen. (Iowa City, State Historical Society, 1918, pp. xi, 270.) The history of Minnesota, from the beginning of American occupation to its organization as a territory in 1848 and, to a less extent, during the territorial period which closed in 1858, centres very largely around Fort Snelling. Any adequate account of the fort, therefore, must be a contribution to the history of the region in all its varied phases. It should be more than

that, however; it should also add to our knowledge of the history of the frontier, of that process by which one region after another has been occupied by the expanding forces of the American nation and transformed from a wilderness to settled communities. Mr. Hansen's book possesses these qualifications. It was his purpose to write of Fort Snelling as an institution, as "a type of the many remote military stations which were scattered throughout the West"; and in this he has been successful. At the same time he has recounted in an entertaining manner many of the incidents and events that make up the content of Minnesota history.

The first three chapters outline the story of the region and the post from the French explorations to the attempted sale of the reservation in 1858. The remainder of the book, ten chapters, consists of essays on various phases of the history of the fort and of developments connected with it either directly or indirectly. The careers of the more important commanding officers are sketched, the fort itself and the surrounding region are described, and the routine of garrison life is vividly portrayed. The large part which the Indians played in the early history of the region comes out in chapters dealing with the work of the Indian agent, feuds between Chippewa and Sioux, the fur-trade, missionary activities, and, finally, treaties for the cession of land. Another chapter is devoted to the visits of various distinguished people—explorers, writers, and tourists. The book concludes fittingly with an account of the beginnings of civilian settlement in the region and the relations between settlers and soldiers. This topical arrangement results in a rather static treatment of the subject—the reader does not get an adequate impression of the development of the region as a whole during the period; but it helps, on the other hand, to bring out the character of the fort as an institution.

The author has consulted a large amount of material both manuscript and printed, and has used it, in general, with discrimination. Although marred by occasional grammatical slips, such as a singular verb with a plural noun and a pronoun without an antecedent, the style is spirited; and the book should have an appeal to the lay reader. The scholar, too, if he have patience to track the foot-notes to their lair at the end of the book, will find much to assist him in further and more intensive research.

The book is attractively printed and bound, is indexed, and contains two illustrations. Its interest and usefulness might have been increased by reproductions of some of the contemporary maps of the reservation and the surrounding region and especially by the inclusion of a critical bibliography of the material consulted.

SOLON J. BUCK.

## HISTORICAL NEWS

### AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The annual meeting of the American Historical Association will take place at Cleveland on Friday and Saturday, December 28 and 29. The committee on programme, which consists of Professor Samuel B. Harding, chairman, and Professors J. S. Bassett, Carl Becker, E. J. Benton, A. E. R. Boak, W. E. Dodd, and Julius Klein, has secured the presence of M. Marcel Knecht, who will discuss the subject of Alsace-Lorraine, of Professor George M. Wrong of Toronto, who will speak on the new organization of the British Empire, of Lord Charnwood, the biographer of Lincoln (who is to make an address at the Illinois Centennial Celebration this month), and of Professor Thomas Masaryk, who will speak on some subject connected with the history and aspirations of the Czecho-Slovaks. The committee is planning also to have papers, if possible, on certain phases of the Russian situation, such as those relating to the Baltic provinces and the Ukraine, and sessions on the history of the United States and of Latin America in the light of the war. The committee, it will at once be seen, contemplates a programme of exceptional character, and a meeting which will powerfully stimulate patriotic thought and endeavor—the only kind of meeting which would be justified under the present circumstances of the nation. One session will be devoted to simultaneous gatherings of those interested in ancient history, and in the teaching of history, to the conference of historical societies, and to the meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, with attractive programmes in each case. The presidential address will be delivered by Mr. William R. Thayer.

The *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* for 1917, which will consist of but one volume, was sent to the printer about the first of September. Page-proof of the two volumes of the annual report for 1916 is ready for indexing. The General Index, 1884–1914, prepared by Mr. David M. Matteson in excellent fashion, and sure to be of great use to historical students, has been distributed (*Annual Report*, 1914, vol. II.).

It again becomes necessary to call public attention to an effort to make unauthorized use of the name of the Association. Certain persons giving the address "American Historical Association, 1417 U Street, Washington, D. C.", have been sending circulars to large numbers of civilians who have been voluntarily assisting the government, on draft boards and the like, requesting them to fill out blanks with biographical data for an extensive compilation of such materials, to supply personal



photographs, and pay money. It should be needless to remark that no such undertakings have the slightest warrant from the American Historical Association, and that the method employed is regarded by it with the severest reprobation. Steps have been taken toward preventing continuance of such use of the Association's name.

Because of conditions induced by the war, the Military History Prize Committee has decided that it is inexpedient to attempt to award the prize this year. Accordingly the contest has been postponed until further notice.

#### NATIONAL BOARD FOR HISTORICAL SERVICE

A meeting of the Board was held at Branford, Conn., on September 11 and 12. Reports of progress in the fields of research, educational service, international service, and materials for war history were made. Professor Greene being unable to continue longer as chairman of the Board, Professor Dana C. Munro was elected chairman in his place and Professor Joseph Schafer was elected vice-chairman.

All reports from England agree in indicating that the series of lectures by Professor McLaughlin, given in Great Britain, chiefly in British universities, during April and May, under arrangements concerted by the Board, was attended with extraordinary success and usefulness. Professor McLaughlin gave four lectures at University College, London, two before the Royal Historical Society, one at the Royal Colonial Institute, one at a gathering of some two thousand teachers, one to a large audience of workingmen at Walsall, and single lectures at the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen, at Trinity College, Dublin, and at the university colleges of Bangor, Bristol, Cardiff, Exeter, Newcastle, Nottingham, Reading, and Southampton. There can be no doubt that much good was accomplished by these efforts to explain to educated British audiences the historic and present-day relations of America to Great Britain and to the war, made by one so well informed in these matters, so full of right feeling, and so judicious. It is expected that a full report of the expedition, by Mr. Charles Moore, who bore an important and helpful part in it, will shortly be printed. One of the lectures is printed in the July number of *History*. The series delivered at University College will be published in a volume by Messrs. Dent.

In the prize essay contest for historical essays on the origins of American participation in the war, in which the awards in individual states have already been made, the "national contest" has now been decided, the prize among high school teachers being awarded to Mr. Elmer W. Johnson, of Roselle, N. J., and that for elementary teachers to Mr. William T. Miller, of the Agassiz Grammar School, Jamaica Plain, Mass.

A large proportion of the articles which will constitute the Board's contribution to the *History Teacher's Magazine* during the present

school year has been arranged for. The supplement for the October number will contain documents illustrating the contemporary British Empire, edited by Professor A. L. Cross. In the place of the series dealing with the four conventional fields commonly taught in secondary schools, there will be, as already announced, a number of shorter series of articles, on such topics as Historic Problems of the Near East, the British Empire, Economic Aspects of the War, Contemporary European Government, etc. The modifications effected in the policy of the *Magazine*, and accompanying its new title, *The Historical Outlook*, are described below (see under "General").

An *Outline of an Emergency Course of Instruction on the War for American Schools*, prepared for the Board by Messrs. C. A. Coulomb, A. J. Gerson, and A. E. McKinley, is issued from the Government Printing Office under the auspices of the Bureau of Education.

The *War Reader* for English classes in elementary schools, prepared for the Board under the direction of Professor Dana C. Munro, is shortly to be published by Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons. The *French War Reader*, prepared by Mr. W. G. Leland and Mr. Charles A. Downer, and to be published later by Messrs. Scribner, is nearly ready for the press. These readers will contain selections from the best prose and poetry of the war.

The series of historical lectures in the great military camps, heretofore mentioned in these pages as maintained during the spring, has been continued during the summer with the new supplies of recruits, in several of the camps. A large expansion of the plan of giving the soldiers historical instruction as to the origins of the war is contemplated by the Military Morale Section of the War Department. Plans for instruction along similar lines are also involved in the war aims courses which are to be given in many of the universities and colleges under the auspices of the Educational Committee of the War Department.

Messrs. R. D. W. Connor, Solon J. Buck, and M. M. Quaife have been appointed a committee for the Board, to prepare a report on the work of state historical institutions in relation to the preservation of war records.

#### PERSONAL

Reverend Father Arthur E. Jones, S.J., archivist of St. Mary's College in Montreal, died on January 19, at the age of nearly eighty. Aside from the notable assistance he rendered in the editing of Dr. Thwaites's *Jesuit Relations*, the principal work by which he made known to the world a part of his remarkable learning in Canadian history was the *Fifth Annual Report of the Archives Department of Ontario*—the volume entitled *Huron*, dealing minutely with the history of the Huron Indians and the missions among them.

Herbert Levi Osgood, professor of American history in Columbia University since 1890, died on September 13, at the age of sixty-three. His chief work, *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*, marked by great accuracy, thoroughness of research, and clearness and precision of statement, has long been recognized as authoritative in its field. He was a devoted teacher, with an exceptional gift for training students in correct methods of research, a tireless worker, and a man of elevated character. It is gratifying to know that his manuscript on the eighteenth century (probably four volumes) was left practically ready for publication.

Charles Henry Hart died on July 29, at the age of seventy. For twenty years, 1882-1902, he was director of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts in Philadelphia. An authority of the highest standing in matters relating to historical portraiture, he had published books on Houdon, on Gilbert Stuart, on Robert Morris, and on portraits of Washington.

Paul Vidal de La Blache, the foremost of French geographers, author of the volume on the historical geography of France prefixed to Lavissee's *Histoire de France*, and of *La France de l'Est* (1917), and of other writings in the field of historical geography, died on April 5, at the age of seventy-three.

Georges Duruy, son of Victor Duruy, biographer of Cardinal Carlo Caraffa, editor of the memoirs of Barras, professor of history in the École Polytechnique, died at the end of March, aged sixty-five.

Mr. J. J. Tracy having resigned the position of archivist of Massachusetts, the secretary of the commonwealth has appointed Mr. John H. Edmonds to the care of the Massachusetts state archives.

Professors Theodore F. Collier of Brown University and Frederick L. Thompson of Amherst College have gone to France in the war service of the Young Men's Christian Association. Professor Collier's place is for the present year to be taken by Professor E. C. Griffith of William Jewell College.

Dr. John C. Hildt of Smith College has been promoted from assistant professor to professor of history; he has been commissioned a captain and is doing service with the Military Intelligence Bureau at Washington. Professors Charles M. Andrews, of Yale University, and A. L. P. Dennis, of Wisconsin, have accepted captains' commissions for work in the same bureau.

Rev. Ralph Pomeroy has been appointed professor of ecclesiastical history in the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in New York.

Mrs. William E. Lingelbach is for the present year to act as professor of history at Bryn Mawr, in the absence of Professor Howard

L. Gray. Dr. C. W. David has become associate professor in the same institution.

The University of Pittsburg has advanced Dr. Homer J. Webster to the rank of professor of history, and has appointed Mr. Alfred P. James assistant professor of history.

Rear-Admiral William W. Kimball, U. S. N., has been placed in charge of a History Section created by the Navy Department. Professor Frederic L. Paxson of Wisconsin has been commissioned as major in the Historical Section of the General Staff of the War Department.

Mr. Charles Moore of Detroit, treasurer of the American Historical Association, has accepted temporary appointment by Dr. Putnam as acting chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, with a view to a large expansion of the library's activities in the collection of material relating to the present war and its administrative history.

Professor William T. Laprade of Trinity College, N. C., has been granted leave of absence for the coming year to act as lecturer in the Y. M. C. A. training camp at Blue Ridge, N. C.

Professors Conyers Read of the University of Chicago, and William W. Davis of Kansas State University have been given leave of absence to engage in the overseas service of the American Red Cross.

Professor Carl R. Fish has leave of absence from the University of Wisconsin to take charge of interests of the American University Union in London.

Dr. Mason W. Tyler has been made assistant professor of history in the University of Minnesota.

At the page corresponding to this in our last number an erroneous statement was made regarding the present status of Dr. Edgar E. Robinson. His position is that of associate professor of American history in Stanford University.

Dr. Cardinal L. Goodwin has been appointed professor of American history in Mills College, at Oakland, Cal.

#### GENERAL

The editor of the *History Teacher's Magazine*, Professor Albert E. McKinley, has an enlarged programme for its future, broadening its scope and intending to appeal more largely than hitherto to the general reader, but still consulting always the interests of teachers of history. In accordance with this expansion the journal takes on a new title. *The Historical Outlook*. Its relations to the American Historical Association and to the National Board for Historical Service remain unchanged.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIV.—10.

A striking modification of the work of the colleges and universities in respect to history arises from the action of the War Department in laying down a special brief curriculum for students of military age. Under agreements into which almost all colleges have entered, all students above the age of eighteen, besides a certain amount of mathematics and modern languages, will pursue a "War Aims Course" of at most nine months, an important element of which is the study of the historical and economic background of the war; but courses in the contemporary history of modern Europe, England, or the United States, approved by the "regional directors" appointed by the War Department, will be accepted as equivalents. The young men are a part of the military forces of the United States, which pays the cost of the required instruction.

A group of able students and teachers have joined to establish in New York an Independent School of Social Science—free both in the sense of independence from universities and their type of administrative control by lay trustees, and in that of freedom from formal requirements and academic routine. The plans are discussed in the *Nation* of September 7, and in a circular which may be obtained from the secretary, Mrs. Victor Sorchan, 267 Madison Avenue, New York. The fundamental notion is that of untrammelled pursuit of such investigations in the political and social sciences as will most promote political and social progress, by casting light on the problems that actually confront the America of the present day. Historical investigation, in so far as it is intelligently directed toward these ends, will have a large place in the work of the new institution. The methods of instruction are expected to be marked by a freedom and originality corresponding to the emancipated conceptions underlying the whole endeavor. The actual beginning of work in this new experiment of education will occur about a year from now. The regular students are expected to be only such as have already shown capacity for advanced studies. The committee of organization consists of Professors James H. Robinson, Charles A. Beard, and Alvin Johnson, Mr. Herbert Croly, and Mrs. George Haven Putnam.

A group of Americans now in Italy, earnestly desiring, in the interest of future international relations, to promote a fuller knowledge of America in that country, are establishing in Rome an institution called the Library for American Studies in Italy. It is hoped that large subscriptions toward an endowment and many gifts of books suitable to such a purpose may be obtained. In the provisional organization first formed, the trustees are the American ambassador, Maj. James Byrne, and Comm. H. Nelson Gay. Books may be sent to the last-named gentleman, at the Palazzo Orsini, in Rome. They may best be sent singly, by ordinary post. The undertaking obviously deserves the warm support of American historical students.

The *List of American Doctoral Dissertations printed in 1916*, prepared by Miss Alida M. Stephens, has been received from the Library of Congress. To this list are prefixed lists supplementary to those contained in previous issues of this catalogue, of theses printed in 1912, 1913, 1914, and 1915. The topical arrangement of the titles of the theses makes it possible to turn at once to those dealing with history (pp. 108-113).

The *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society at its meeting of October, 1917, embrace an interesting paper on Student Life at Yale College in the time of the first President Dwight, by Professor Franklin B. Dexter; five moderately important letters of Pedro de la Gasca, 1546-1548, found by Mr. M. H. Saville in the archives of Guatemala, and relating to the subjugation of Peru; and a paper by Professor G. H. Blakeslee entitled Will Democracy alone make the World Safe? In the report of the council, under the form of a review of his ten years' presidency, Mr. Waldo Lincoln presents the best available statement of the society's recent acquisitions and activities. With these 100 pages of proceedings, Mr. Brigham presents 140 pages of his bibliography of American newspapers, to 1820, covering the papers of New York City.

The July number of the *Journal of Negro History* is almost entirely occupied by a study of slavery in Kentucky, by Mr. Ivan E. McDougale, apparently a doctoral dissertation of Clark University. This study exists also as a separate volume (published by Carter G. Woodson, 1216 U Street, N. W., Washington) and as such is subject to later review in this journal.

Persons who have been persuaded to put faith in the arguments or assertions of H. S. Chamberlain, of L. Woltmann, or of Madison Grant respecting the "superior race" may find a corrective in Professor A. Niceforo's *I Germani: Storia di un' Idea e di una Razza*.

The historian of religious movements of modern times will find interesting material set forth with scholarly care in Professor Edward G. Browne's *Materials for the Study of the Bábí Religion* (Cambridge University Press).

*The Romance of Commerce*, by Mr. H. Gordon Selfridge (John Lane) presents much material interesting to the students of economic history and to those interested in the history of civilization.

Col. Sir Thomas H. Holdich, author of *Political Frontiers and Boundary Making*, has gathered a number of his recent lectures into a volume which he calls *Boundaries in Europe and the Near East*.

*The Seventh Continent: a History of the Discovery and Explorations of Antarctica*, by Helen Smith Wright, is published by Badger.

## ANCIENT HISTORY

Dr. J. Rendel Harris's *Testimonies*, part I., is devoted to showing that those passages of the Old Testament which were regarded as prophetic of the New were derived from a collection made in a lost work of Hegesippus; this work he intends to reconstruct in part II.

*The Delphic Oracle: its Early History, Influence, and Fall* (Oxford, Blackwell), by Rev. T. Dempsey, is a careful study of the subject from the point of view of a student of the history of religion.

Books I.-V. of Xenophon's *Hellenica*, with an English translation by Mr. Carleton L. Brownson, have been added to the *Loeb Library*.

In a doctoral dissertation for the University of Paris, *Recherches sur le Développement de la Pensée Juridique et Morale en Grèce* (Paris, Leroux, 1917, pp. xviii, 476), which its author, M. Louis Gernet, characterizes as an *étude sémantique*, careful study is made of the chief words used in Greek criminal law, of *ἔσθις*, *ἀδικία*, *τιμωρία*, *ἀμαρτία*, and the like, and of the historical and sociological development of their meanings—the whole in a manner productive of much illumination.

Volume I. of *A Short History of Rome*, planned by Guglielmo Ferrero and Corrado Barbagallo, has appeared from the press of Messrs. Putnam. This volume deals with Rome from its foundation to the death of Julius Caesar.

Dr. J. Holwerda, of Leiden, has discovered at Ubbergen, near Nijmegen, the remains of the capital town of the Batavi, burned at the time of their revolt in A. D. 70, and, near by, a large Roman fortress built for the tenth legion after the victory over Civilis (J. Holwerda, *De Stad der Bataven en de Romeinsche Vesting te Nijmegen*, Leiden, Brill, 1918).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Egypt and Mesopotamia* (Ancient Egypt, 1917, I.); *id.*, *The Geography of the Gods* (*ibid.*, 1917, III.); D. G. Lyon, *Recent Excavations at Babylon* (Harvard Theological Review, July); Edmond Power, *Ancient Nineveh* (Studies: an Irish Quarterly Review, March); L. Bodin, *Histoire et Biographie: Phanias d'Érèse* (Revue des Études Grecques, April, 1917); H. A. L. Fisher, *The Last of the Latin Historians* [Ammianus Marcellinus] (Quarterly Review, July).

## EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Messrs. Macmillan have published a volume entitled *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry*, by various authors, edited by Mr. H. B. Swete, which surveys the origin and early development of the Church from the historical standpoint. A similar purpose dominates *The Evolution of the Christian Ministry* by the Rev. J. R. Cohu, who, however, does not limit himself so strictly to historical investigation but enters into modern controversies (John Murray).



The Ingersoll lecture for 1918—delivered at Harvard University upon a foundation for annual lectures relating to immortality—was given by Professor Clifford H. Moore, and has now been published by the Harvard University Press as a small volume entitled *Pagan Ideas of Immortality during the Early Christian Centuries*.

Professor Elmer T. Merrill in a critical note contributed to the *American Journal of Theology*, July, 1918, argues that the First Epistle of Clement was written about 140 A. D. and that the reputed Bishop Clement probably never existed. Professor Merrill announces an article for the forthcoming October number of the same journal in which he will disprove the supposed persecution of the Roman Christians by Domitian.

*Recherches de Science Religieuse* (May–September, 1918) contains an article by Gustav Bardy on *L'Église d'Antioche de 260 à 272*, in which the career of Paul of Samosata is exhibited in relation to the politics of Zenobia of Palmyra.

An authoritative work by Jacques Zeiller, professor in the University of Fribourg in Switzerland, deals with early Christianity in the Balkan region and the conversion of the Goths—*Les Origines Chrétiennes dans les Provinces Danubiennes de l'Empire Romain* (Paris, E. de Boccard, 1918, pp. iv, 667), and is complementary to his earlier study of the same topic for Dalmatia (1906). The work extends through the transition from Arianism to Catholicism. The same author, in *Paganus: Étude de Terminologie Historique* (*ibid.*, 1917, pp. 112), has confirmed the traditional derivation and significance of the word, as a "countryman", as opposed to the recent suggestion of legal connotation as "civilian".

The author of *The Patrimony of the Roman Church in the Time of Gregory the Great* (Cambridge University Press), Mr. Edward Spearing, had in preparation before his death a study of the Roman Patrimony extending through six centuries. His sister, Miss Evelyn M. Spearing, has been able to prepare and publish that portion of the work which deals with the development, organization, and government of the patrimony under Gregory the Great.

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY

To medieval church history, A. Serafini has contributed *Innocenzo III. e la Riforma Religiosa agli Inizi del Secolo XIII.* (Rome, L'Arcadia, 1917); and August Meyer, *Der Politische Einfluss Deutschlands und Frankreichs auf den Metzzer Bischofswahlen im Mittelalter* (Metz, Müller, 1916, pp. ix, 133).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. I. Bell, *The Byzantine Servile State in Egypt* (*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, April, 1917); L. Halphen, *Études Critiques sur l'Histoire de Charlemagne*, IV. *Le Moine de Saint-Gall* (*Revue Historique*, July); W. Miller, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (*Quarterly Review*, July).

## MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Volume III. of *The Epistles of Erasmus*, arranged and edited by Mr. Francis M. Nichols, is announced by Messrs. Longmans; it closes with 1520.

Messrs. Macmillan announce *A Study of Calvin and Other Papers*, by the late Dr. Allan Menzies, with a memoir of the author by his daughter.

The mutual relations of the Protestant states of Europe in the decade following the treaties of Westphalia are revealed, to some extent, in *Die Gesandtschaft der Protestantischen Schweiz bei Cromwell und den Generalstaaten der Niederlande, 1652-1654* (Bern. Grünau, 1916, pp. iv, 113), by Dr. T. Ischer. To the same period belongs *Die Kandidatur Ludwigs XIV. bei der Kaiserwahl vom Jahre 1658* (Berlin, Rothschild, 1916, pp. vii, 108), by Dr. S. F. N. Gie.

Under the title *La Monarchie Française dans l'Adriatique* (Paris, Bloud and Gay, pp. xxx, 241) Count Louis de Voïnovitch narrates the history of the relations of the French kings with the republic of Ragusa from 1667 to 1789. M. Ernest Denis supplies a preface reviewing the earlier history of Ragusa.

The affairs of the Ionian Islands in the Napoleonic period furnish the subject of G. Douin's *La Méditerranée de 1803 à 1805, Pirates et Corsaires aux Iles Ioniennes* (Paris, Plon, 1917, pp. 288); and of *Nos Anciens à Corfou, Souvenirs de l'Aide-Major Lamare-Picquot, 1807-1814* (Paris, Alcan, 1918, pp. x, 256), edited by H. Pernot. The latter volume contains an appendix on the French Academy at Corfu.

Little, Brown, and Company have issued *The Progress of Continental Law in the Nineteenth Century*, by various authors.

Two volumes of *The Memoirs of the Comte de Mercy Argenteau*, translated by G. S. Hellman, have appeared from the press of Messrs. Putnam. The first volume is concerned with Napoleon and the Empire, the second, and more important, chiefly with the Belgian revolution of 1830.

*La Révolution de Juillet 1830 et l'Europe* (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1918), by the Vicomte de Guichen, is a contribution of the first importance, based not only upon the archives of the French Foreign Office from 1824 to 1833, but also upon investigations in the archives of London, Brussels, Berlin, Petrograd, Vienna, and Munich. The volume deals with the events both antecedent and consequent to the revolution.

Baruch Hagani is the author of an account of *Le Sionisme Politique et son Fondateur, Théodore Herzl, 1860-1904* (Paris, Payot, 1917).

Volume II. of Pietro Orsi's *Gli Ultimi Cento Anni di Storia Universale*, covering the years 1871 to 1915, has recently appeared (Rome. Società Tip.-Ed. Nazionale). The first volume of the work (1815-1870) was published in 1915.

The course of lectures given in 1915-1916 by Joseph Barthélemy in the École des Hautes Études Sociales, on *Démocratie et Politique Étrangère* (Paris, Alcan, 1917, pp. 535) has appeared in book form.

Professor H. Vander Linden and Paul Hamelius, of Liège University, have completed a volume on *Anglo-Belgian Relations, Past and Present*, which is announced among the forthcoming works of Messrs. Constable.

M. Battifol in *Les Anciennes Républiques Alsaciennes* (Flammarion) defends the thesis that the Alsatians are not Germans but Celts, and that from earliest times they have found their closest affinity with the French people.

Mr. Coleman Phillipson's study of the historical and political aspects of the Alsace-Lorraine question is published by Messrs. Fisher Unwin under the title *Alsace-Lorraine, Past, Present, and Future*.

Professor Lujo Brentano's *Elsässer Erinnerungen* (Berlin, Reiss, 1917, pp. 157) presents this veteran economist's recollections of his six years' professorate at Strassburg, 1882-1887; upon the nature of German rule in Alsace-Lorraine his observations cast much more light than he is aware.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. G. Davenport and L. F. Brown, *The Freedom of the Seas* (Unpopular Review, July-September); R. M. Jones, *The Anabaptists and Minor Sects in the Reformation* (Harvard Theological Review, July); René Doumergue, *Calvin et l'Entente* [descent of political theories] (Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, October-December, 1917); R. Peyre, *Coup d'Oeil sur la Question d'Orient en France au XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Revue des Études Historiques, April); A. Aulard, *La Révolution Américaine et la Révolution Française—les Origines: William Penn et Locke* (Révolution Française, January-February); M. I. Newbigin, *Some Aspects of the Industrial Revolution in Western Europe* (Scottish Geographical Magazine, July); O. Karmin, *Autour des Négociations Financières Anglo-Prusso-Russes de 1813* [concl.] (Revue Historique de la Révolution Française et de l'Empire, October, 1917); E. Babelon, *Sarrebrück et la Diplomatie Prussienne en 1815* (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 15); E. Rodocanachi, *La Police Secrète Autrichienne et les Français dans les Provinces Lombardo-Vénitiennes de 1815 à 1819* (Revue Historique, May); A. Gérard, *Les Tentatives d'Influence Allemande en Angleterre* (Revue de Paris, May 1); E. Daudet, *Le Mariage de Dagmar, Princesse de Danemark, 1866* (Revue Hebdomadaire, June 8); E. Daudet, *La France et l'Allemagne après le Congrès de Berlin: la Mission du Baron de Courcel, 1882-1886*, I., II. (Correspondant, April 25, May 25); E. de Guichen, *Les Relations Politiques Russo-Allemandes du XIX<sup>e</sup> au XX<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Compte Rendu de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, May); Hubert Hall, *The Sources of Contemporary History* (Contemporary Review, June).

## THE GREAT WAR

The Library of Congress has in preparation a *Check List of European War Literature* possessed by it, and a *List of Maps applicable to the World War*, compiled under the direction of Mr. P. Lee Phillips.

Hon. John W. Fortescue and Sir Julian Corbett have been appointed as the chief official military and naval historians of the war on the part of the British government, and M. Gabriel Hanotaux as the chief French official historian of the war. The government of the Dominion of Canada, besides maintaining from the beginning of the war an elaborate system for recording in Flanders, France, and England all the doings of the Canadian forces, has instituted a War Survey, the product of which will be a complete and comprehensive key to all classes of public war records, to all the departments and offices where they originate and are to be found, and to the nature and inter-relationships of all the activities in the course of which they are produced. Such a survey, aided by co-operation with the official record agents and historians of the imperial and allied governments, will, it is hoped, result in eventual concentration of an unexampled mass of original evidence respecting the war in one great national collection at Ottawa, on which official and other histories may be securely based.

The attention of historical students should be called to the existence of the Bibliothèque et Musée de la Guerre established by the French government in Paris, and to the fact that they can assist in making it a valuable library for future historians by sending documents, periodicals, newspapers, and clippings bearing on the history of the war to Professor Adolphe Cohn of Columbia University, who represents in the United States this valuable institution. It may be well to communicate with Professor Cohn by letter before making any shipments, so as to avoid duplication of material, but if it will lessen the labor of contributors to ship without any previous correspondence, he will be none the less grateful.

Berlin has recently had an exhibition of a library of literature of the present war, assembled by an anonymous German millionaire, and including 38,000 war books and pamphlets in various languages, 2500 newspapers, including many of those published in the German and Allied trenches, and hundreds of placards, proclamations, food tickets, and the like. An English millionaire has made a similar collection, of perhaps equal extent.

*The Times Documentary History of the War* (London), vol. V., pt. I., deals with the military history of the British expedition, and especially with the machinery that created the British army; vol. VI., pt. I., consists of documents dealing with Canada's entrance into the war.

In *Collected Materials for the Study of the War* (Philadelphia, McKinley Publishing Company, pp. 180, quarto), Professor A. E.

McKinley has brought together, partly from supplements of the *History Teacher's Magazine*, seven sections offering a large variety of useful data for school use: President Wilson's chief addresses, Professor Harding's Topical Outline, a syllabus for the study of preliminaries, by Mr. H. L. Hoskins, Messrs. Harding and Lingelbach's maps and geographical explanations, Professor Dutcher's Bibliography, the texts of the chief statutes of the United States relating to the state of war, and the chief executive proclamations and orders.

Volume I., no. 4 (April, 1918), of *A League of Nations*, the bi-monthly publication of the World Peace Foundation, is entitled *The Background of the War: History and Texts*, and gives in convenient form the essential documents of the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, with analogous pieces. The documents are in many cases not easily found elsewhere, and they are prepared with much care.

In our last issue we made an erroneous statement respecting the publication of Professor Munroe Smith's translation of Prince Lichnowsky's Memorandum. This edition, which we must think to be the best, is brought out by the American Association for International Conciliation, which we understand is preparing to make free distribution of 100,000 copies of the pamphlet. Other versions are printed by the *New York Times* and by Doran. Professor Smith's edition presents the German text, a careful English translation, notes, and a translation of von Jagow's reply.

The book of Wilhelm Mühlton, a former director in Krupp's establishment, of which mention has previously been made, is entitled, in the English translation, just published by Messrs. Putnam, *The Vandal of Europe: an Exposé of the Inner Workings of Germany's Policy of World Domination and its Brutalizing Consequences*.

G. Pariset, *Leurs Buts de Guerre*, no. 137 of *Pages d'Histoire* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917, pp. 115) presents, with explanatory notes, a mass of documents showing German ambitions, from the triumphant dreams of 1914 to the more moderate but still extensive demands put forward early in 1917. Similar material, gathered by M. Jean Ruplinger, professor in the University of Lyons, occupies the volume *Also sprach Germania: Ainsi parlait l'Allemagne* (Paris, La Sirène, pp. xvi, 264).

*A Reply to the German White Book of May 10, 1915 (Die Völkerrechtswidrige Führung des Belgischen Volkskriegs)*, has been issued by the Belgian Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (London, H. M. Stationery Office, pp. 375). The first part of this publication deals in a general manner with the accusations brought by Germany against the civilian population in Belgium; in the second part, the chapters devoted in the White Book to events at Aerschot, Andenne, Dinant, and Louvain, are subjected to special scrutiny. The protests of Monsignors Heylen and Rutten to Gov.-Gen. Baron von Bissing, No-

vember 6, 1915, the letter of the Belgian episcopate, November 24, 1915, proposing to the Austro-German bishops the constitution of a joint commission to inquire into the alleged acts of cruelty on the part of Belgian citizens, and various other documents, make up the third part of the volume.

P. Fauchille and J. Basdevant have edited *La Guerre de 1915, Jurisprudence Italienne en Matière de Prises Maritimes, Recueil de Décisions, suivi des Textes intéressants le Droit International Maritime publiés par l'Italie pendant la Guerre* (Paris, Rousseau, 1918, pt. I., pp. 288). Professor O. Nippold of Bern has discussed *Die Gestaltung des Völkerrechts nach dem Weltkrieg* (Zürich, Orell Füssli, 1917, pp. vi, 285).

The British Admiralty Board has issued *Merchant Tonnage and the Submarine*, a statement of the war cabinet showing, for the United Kingdom and for the world, during the period August, 1914–December, 1917, mercantile losses by enemy action and marine risk, mercantile shipping output, and enemy vessels captured and brought into service. Under official sanction of the Admiralty, L. Cope Cornford has written *The Merchant Seaman in War* (Doran, pp. 320), which gives some examples of the doings and endurance of the men of the mercantile marine during the first three years of the war. The introduction is by Admiral Lord Jellicoe.

A French psychologist, Dr. Lucien-Graux, has illustrated an important aspect of warfare by *Les Fausses Nouvelles de la Grande Guerre* (Paris, Édition Fr. Illustrée, 1918, pp. 398), in the first volume of which the history of similar phenomena in previous wars is also treated.

A *Memorandum* by the Serbian socialist party upon conditions and German atrocities in occupied Serbia, presented to the Russo-Dutch-Scandinavian committee in Stockholm, with a preface by Camille Huysmans, has been issued by the Serbian Press Bureau (Washington). *A Nation at Bay* (Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, pp. 229), by Ruth S. Farnam, an American, is an account of what the author saw in Serbia and of her hospital service in that country.

A *Report* on the treatment by the enemy of British prisoners of war behind the firing lines in France and Belgium, has been issued by the British Government's Committee on Treatment of British Prisoners of War.

German views and acts are described and condemned in *Les Déformations du Droit des Gens en Allemagne avant la Guerre* (Dijon, Imp. Berthier, 1918, pp. 152) by G. Combescure; in *La Barbarie Allemande* (Paris, Plon, 1918) by P. Gaultier; in *L'Assassin Innombrable, 1914–1917* (Paris, Renaissance, 1917, pp. 96) by F. Champsaur; and in *Militarism at Work in Belgium and Germany* (London, Unwin, 1917, pp. iii, 91) by K. G. Ossianilsson, translated by H. G. Wright, which is an account of the deportations.

*The Sword and the Plough*, by Diego Angeli, now translated into English, recounts the devastation wrought by the German army and the agricultural reconstruction accomplished by the British in reconquered regions (Constable).

M. Florent-Matter in *L'Alsace-Lorraine pendant la Guerre: les Alsaciens-Lorrains contre l'Allemagne* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1918, pp. 239) brings together a great amount of detailed information concerning the Alsatians who, escaping from Germany or returning from other countries, have taken part in the warfare against Germany (ten thousand of them enlisted in the Foreign Legion in 1914), and concerning the numberless executions, severities, and brutalities that have marked German rule in the Reichsland in the last four years.

Experiences and conditions under the German occupation in north-eastern France are described by Madeleine Havard de la Montagne in *La Vie Agonisante des Pays Occupés, Lille et la Belgique, Notes d'un Témoin, Octobre 1914-Juillet 1916* (Paris, Perrin, 1917); by Abbé C. Calippe in *La Somme sous l'Occupation Allemande, 27 Août 1914-19 Mars 1917* (Paris, Téqui, 1918, pp. viii, 310); by Comte de Caix de Saint-Aymour in *Autour de Noyon, sur les Traces des Barbares* (Paris, Boivin, 1918); and by Marguerite Yerta in *Les Six Femmes et l'Invasion, Août 1914-Février 1916* (Paris, Plon, 1917).

General Malleterre in *Les Campagnes de 1915* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, pp. 306) brings together the studies which this accomplished military authority contributed, respecting this year of warfare, to the *Temps*, the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and the *Nouvelle Revue*. His third volume of *Études et Impressions de Guerre* (Paris, Tallandier, 1917, pp. 360) deals with the third year of the war, ending with July, 1917. It includes discussion not only of events on the Western and Italian fronts but also of the Russian revolution, the crushing of Rumania, and the entrance of the United States into the war. Gen. F. Canonge, formerly professor in the École Supérieure de Guerre, has published a study of *La Bataille de la Marne* (Paris, Fournier, 1918, pp. 140). G. Ledos has translated the account of *L'Assaut contre Verdun, 21 Février-31 Mars 1916* (Paris, Colin, 1918, pp. xvi, 366) by the Spanish observer, E. Diaz-Retg.

*General Foch* (Houghton Mifflin, pp. 53), is an appreciation by Maj. Robert M. Johnston, now a member of the Historical Branch of the General Staff, U. S. A.

Emmanuel Bourcier, a French officer who was later sent to America as an instructor in our camps, in *Under the German Shells* (Scribner, pp. 217), writes of French mobilization, the German invasion, gas attacks, and the battles of the Marne, Rheims, Champagne, and Verdun. The translation is by G. N. and Mary R. Holt.



*Mons and the Retreat*, by "a staff officer" (Capt. G. S. Gordon), is a slight but authoritative source for the study of this episode in the Great War.

Professor Raoul Allier's *Les Allemands à St. Dié, 27 Août-10 Septembre, 1914* (Paris, Payot, 1918, pp. xvi, 297, with 15 maps, plans, and facsimiles), is not an ordinary and ephemeral account of German conquest and treatment of a single town, but a finished piece of history prepared with great intelligence and scrupulous care.

A model narrative of the history of a single city under German bombardment is M. René Mercier's *Nancy Bombardée* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1918, pp. xxiii, 246).

Letters written from the trenches by men of many nations, and of great interest and moving power, are collected by Mrs. N. P. Dawson in a volume entitled *The Good Soldier: a Selection of Soldiers' Letters, 1914-1917* (Macmillan).

*An American Soldier* (Houghton Mifflin, pp. 173) is a collection of personal letters by Lieut. Edwin A. Abbey, 4th Canadian Mounted Rifles, who was killed at Vimy Ridge, telling of his experiences first in the ranks and then as an officer.

Among narratives of individual combatants, a very high place in respect to literary quality belongs to M. Émile Henriot's *Carnet d'un Dragon dans les Tranchées* (Paris, Hachette, 1918, pp. 249), a faithful and even brilliant record of war-life during more than a year in which the warrior had no chance to fire a shot; and to the *Lettres d'un Combattant* of Lieut. Marcel Étévé (Paris, Hachette, 1917, pp. xx, 249), extending from August, 1914, to July 20, 1916, when the writer, an accomplished scholar and composer, was killed in battle. Other French accounts of personal experience which merit attention are: Sergt.-Maj. Georges Lafond's *Covered with Mud and Glory* (Small, Maynard); Capt. Ferdinand Bilmont's *A Crusader of France* (Dutton); and Lieut. Jean Giraudoux's *Campaigns and Intervals* (Houghton Mifflin).

*De Verdun à Mannheim* (Paris, Vitet, 1917) by J. Simonin; *En Allemagne, Impressions d'un Évadé, de Douaumont à Mannheim et aux Camps de Représailles et de Munitions* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917) by G. Vallis, and *En Esclavage, Journal de Deux Déportées* (Paris, Bloud and Gay, 1918) by Henriette Célarié, are additional narratives of French prisoners who have made their way out of Germany.

*The German Pirate* (Doran, pp. 124), by "Ajax", gives accounts of German submarine exploits compiled from British Admiralty documents and sworn statements of survivors.

*Ten Months in a German Raider* (Doran, pp. 178), by Capt. John S. Cameron of the *Beluga*, is an exciting story of his imprisonment aboard the *Wolf*, which during fifteen months' cruise captured fourteen vessels and laid 500 mines.

M. Jacques Mortane's story of Georges Guynemer, who was credited with fifty-three victories over German airmen, has been translated by C. H. Levy under the title, *Guynemer, the Ace of Aces* (Moffat, Yard, pp. 267), containing a biography and transcripts from the aviator's note-book of flight. *High Adventure* (Houghton Mifflin, pp. 236) by James N. Hall; *Knights of the Air* (Appleton, pp. 243), by Lieut. Bennett A. Molter, a pilot aviator of a French escadrille; and *Go Get 'Em* (Boston, Page), by William A. Wellman, are other narratives of air fighting in France. *The Red Battle Flyer* (McBride, pp. 222), is a translation of Capt. Manfred Freiherr von Richthofen's account of aerial operations on the German side.

M. Nadaud is the author of *Guynemer, l'As des As* (Paris, Michel, 1918, pp. 128) and of *La Guerre Aérienne, Chignole* (*ibid.*, pp. 244). *En Plein Ciel: Impressions d'Aviateurs* (Paris, Plon, 1918, pp. iv, 270) is by F. Lacroix. *La Guerre Aérienne Illustrée* (Paris, Édition Française Illustrée, 1917, pp. 400) furnishes over six hundred illustrations.

*Life in a Tank* (Houghton Mifflin, pp. 140), by Richard Haigh, M. C., commander of the tank *Britannia* at Arras and Ypres, gives a clear picture of the training and life in this service.

*A Surgeon in Arms* (Appleton, pp. 309), by Capt. R. J. Marion, M. C., of the Canadian Army Medical Corps, gives, besides the author's personal experiences in the front line trenches from the beginning of the war, a particularly good account of medical work under war conditions.

Experiences in the ambulance field service are to be found in *The White Road of Mystery* (Lane, pp. 173), the note-book of an American *ambulancier*, by Philip D. Orcutt; in "No. 6" (Dutton, pp. 150), by C. de Florez; and in *Ambulancing on the French Front* (Britton, pp. 243), by Edward R. Coyle.

*Fields and Battlefields* (McBride, pp. 260), by "No. 31540" (a sergeant in the Medical Corps), pictures life and scenes in the dressing stations behind the lines.

L. P. Alaux has edited a French translation of the *Souvenirs d'un Sous-Officier Allemand, 1914-1915-1916* (Paris, Payot, 1918), which purports to be the work of a non-commissioned officer who for three years was entrusted with important missions on both the Eastern and Western fronts, but who finally lost faith in the German cause and escaped to Denmark, where this book was written.

*With the Austrian Army in Galicia*, by Octavian C. Tăslăwanu (London, Skeffington) is perhaps more valuable because of its account of the attitude of the Rumanians of Transylvania and their relations to the Austrians than it is because of any military history which it presents.

Volumes relating to Balkan aspects of the war are *Le Monténégro pendant la Grande Guerre* (Paris, Lang and Blanchon, 1918), by V. G. Popovitch; *Avec l'Armée Serbe de l'Ultimatum Autrichien à l'Invasion de la Serbie* (Paris, Michel, 1918), by H. Barby, correspondent of the *Journal of Paris*; *La Roumanie et la Guerre* (Paris, Colin, 1918, pp. 299), by S. Serbesco; and *Le Mystère Roumain et la Défection Russe* (Paris, Plon, 1918), by C. Stiénon.

In the series *Pages d'Histoire* (Paris, Berger-Levrault), tome XIII. is the *Livre Blanc Grec*, containing French translations of seventy-seven documents extending from 1913 (protocol relative to a treaty of alliance between Greece and Serbia) to June, 1917.

*Le Croissant sur la Tranchée: Quelques Aspects de l'Ame Islamique pendant la Guerre* (Paris, Leroux, 1917) is a small volume by L. M. Enfrey.

A good account of the Egyptian operations, to March, 1917, is to be found in *The Desert Campaigns* (London, Constable, pp. 178), by W. T. Massey, official correspondent of London newspapers with the Egyptian expeditionary forces.

Some observations on the Far Eastern aspects of the war are to be found in A. Bellessort's *Un Français en Extrême-Orient au Début de la Guerre* (Paris, Perrin, 1918), and in B. Benzabro's *La Guerre vue par un Japonais* (Vannes, Lafolye, 1917).

The *Taking of Samoa*, an achievement of the New Zealand territorials and volunteers, is recounted by L. P. Leary, an actor in the exploit he narrates.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. Duhem, *La Question Serbe et les Origines de la Guerre* (*Revue de Paris*, June 15); A. Gauvain, *Les Révélations Lichnowsky-Muehlton et l'Encerclement de l'Allemagne* (*ibid.*, June 1); Georges Goyau, *L'Unité Belge et l'Allemagne* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, June 1); L. J. Maxse, *Some Studies in Secret Diplomacy: a Vindication of the Policy of the Allies* (*National Review*, July); Fernand Engerand, *Le Drame de Charleroi: le Prélude Diplomatique, la Tragique Erreur* (*Correspondant*, February 25, March 10, 25); R. Jubert, *Verdun, Mars-Mai 1916* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, June 15, July 1); Joseph Reinach, *L'Offensive de la Somme, Juillet-December 1916*, I., II. (*Revue Historique*, May, July); H. Bidou, *Les Batailles de la Somme*, II., III. [1916, 1918] (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, May 1, 15); X., *La Bataille de France de 1918; entre Somme et Oise* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, July 15); L. R. Freeman, *As a Signalman saw It [destruction of the Emden]* (*Atlantic Monthly*, September); H. Morgenthau, *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story*, IV., V. (*World's Work*, August, September); M. T. Z. Tyau, *Diplomatic Relations between China and the Powers since and concerning the European War* (*Chinese Social and Political Science Review*, December); J. Flach, *La Partici-*

*pation Militaire du Japon et ses Intérêts Vitaux* (Compte Rendu de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, May).

(See also pp. 173, 174.)

#### GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

General review: C. Bémont, *Histoire de Grande Bretagne* (Revue Historique, May).

*History* for April contains discourses on the effect of the war on the teaching of history, by Mr. J. W. Headlam, Professor Paul Mantoux, and others, which are worth consideration by American teachers in spite of all the differences between British and American educational systems. There is also a useful note on disputed questions respecting Warren Hastings, by Mr. J. W. Neill. The July number contains one of Professor McLaughlin's admirable London lectures, on America's Entry into the War: an Historical Statement. There are also papers on the Naval Campaign of 1587, by Mr. Geoffrey Callender, on the work of the Royal Commission on the Public Records, by Mr. Hubert Hall, and on the Effects of the Black Death on Rural Organization in England, by Miss E. E. Power.

J. Wickham Legg's *Studies in Church History; Essays, Liturgical and Historical* (London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917, pp. 187) consists of seven historical studies of Anglican liturgy.

*English Pageantry: an Historical Outline*, by Robert Withington, of which the first volume has been published by the Harvard University Press, deals mainly with "royal entries", court masks having been adequately treated by various scholars, and lord mayor's shows and modern survivals being left to the second volume. The treatise is thorough and interesting.

Number 186 of the *Columbia Studies* is a volume by Miss Harriett Bradley on *The Enclosures in England: an Economic Reconstruction*.

The Navy Records Society expects to publish this autumn its volume for 1917, *The Autobiography of Phineas Pett (1570-1647)*, master-builder of the navy and naval commissioner.

*The English Home from Charles I. to George IV.*, by Mr. J. Alfred Gotch, completes that author's study of the evolution of the English house, begun in *Early Renaissance Architecture* (B. T. Batsford).

Volume XV., numbers 1 and 2, of the *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* (London, Headley), contains, among other things, two eighteenth-century diaries and an account of the travels in America of William Baldwin in 1709.

*The Calendar of the Madras Records, 1740-1744*, by H. Dodwell, curator of the Madras Record Office (Madras Government Press) provides in its summaries of nearly 1800 documents rich material for the

student of Indian history, the East India trade, and the Anglo-French struggle for supremacy in India which broke into open conflict during these years.

A *Life of Lord Clive*, by Sir George Forrest, is announced for early publication by Messrs. Cassell.

Nos. 1 and 2 in volume VII. of the University of Illinois *Studies in the Social Sciences* constitute a good history of *Legislative Regulation of Railway Finance in England*, by Ching Chun Wang, director of the Kin-Han railway in China (pp. 196), formerly a student in the University of Illinois.

*Some Recollections*, by Admiral Sir Cyprian Bridge, covers half a century of naval service beginning with the naval operations in the White Sea during the Crimean War, and including much subsequent naval history relating especially to the Indian Ocean and the South Seas.

Important to the history of science are several recent biographies, prominent among which is Sir William A. Tilden's *Sir William Ramsay, K.C.B., F.R.S.: Memorials of his Life and Work* (Macmillan). Of perhaps greater interest is Mr. Leonard Huxley's *Life and Letters of Sir Joseph Dalton Hooker*, based on material collected and arranged by Lady Hooker (John Murray), and presenting a life which contributed much to the rich scientific achievements of the nineteenth century.

The Rhodes lectures on imperial federation delivered in the University of London, 1917, by A. P. Newton, have appeared under the title, *The Old Empire and the New* (London and Toronto, Dent, pp. 140).

Recent German and French views of England, its empire and imperial problems, are to be found respectively in Hettner's *Englands Weltherrschaft und ihre Krisis* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1917), and Édouard Guyot's *L'Angleterre* (Paris, Delagrave, 1917).

*The Great Crusade* (Doran, pp. 307) is the title given to a volume of extracts from speeches delivered during the war by Lloyd George and arranged by F. L. Stevenson.

J. B. Rye and Horace G. Groser are the joint editors of a volume of extracts from Kitchener's writings and speeches, entitled *Kitchener in his own Words* (Stokes, pp. 588).

The task of writing the life of Lord Courtney has been placed in the competent hands of Mr. G. P. Gooch.

The *Scottish Historical Review* for July has an interesting article by Professor C. H. Firth, on Macaulay's Treatment of Scottish History, one by Lord Guthrie, on the Solemn League and Covenant and its army, apropos of Professor Terry's recent volumes, and a paper by Mr. William Stewart, on John Lennox and the *Greenock Newsclout*, a curious episode of the fight against taxes on knowledge. As a testimonial of regard to Dr. James MacLehose, editor of the *Review*, its

friends have by subscription caused the preparation and issue of a full and very well executed index to volumes I.-XII. (Glasgow, James Mac-Lehose and Sons, 1918, pp. 133).

The late Rev. John Hunter, for twenty-one years a minister in the presbytery of Dunkeld, left behind him an historical manuscript on *The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689* (London, Hodder and Stoughton, two vols., pp. 507, 599) which presents in minute detail a very useful contribution to the ecclesiastical history of Scotland under the Restoration.

An historical survey in a field of increasing importance is Mr. John J. Webb's *Municipal Government in Ireland, Medieval and Modern* (Fisher Unwin). The study begins with the chartered borough of the Norman rule and comes down to 1898.

George H. Knott's *Trial of Roger Casement* (Philadelphia, Cromarty Law Book Company, 1917, pp. xi, 304) is a presentation of the documents which constitute the evidence in the case, together with a brief introduction.

Documentary publications: *Vetus Liber Archidiaconi Eliensis*, ed. C. L. Feltoe and E. H. Minns (Cambridge Antiquarian Society).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Alice S. Green, *The Irish and the Armada* (Studies: an Irish Quarterly Review, March); C. E. Fayle, *The Navigation Acts* (Edinburgh Review, July); C. D. Allin, *Federal Aspects of Preferential Trade in the British Empire* (American Political Science Review, August); A. Ireland, *The True Story of the Jameson Raid as related to me by John Hays Hammond*, I., II. (North American Review, August, September); H. R. G. Inglis, *Early Maps of Scotland and their Authors* (Scottish Geographical Magazine, June).

## FRANCE

Lectures delivered by M. Louis Madelin in the years 1912-1914 and ranging over a large part of French history are now published by Messrs. Plon-Nourrit under the title, *L'Expansion Française: de la Syrie au Rhin* (1918, pp. xxxiii, 331).

More than thirty years ago Mr. Arthur Tilley published an "Introductory Essay" on the French Renaissance, which has now developed into a comprehensive survey (pp. 662) of the spirit of the Renaissance, and its influence in all directions of human activity. The volume, *The Dawn of the French Renaissance*, comes from the Cambridge University Press.

An important source for the Reformation period lately published in the series *Archives de l'Histoire Religieuse de la France* is the *Registre des Procès-Verbaux de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris*, tome I., 1505-1523, edited by Abbé A. Clerval (Paris, J. Gabalda, 1917, pp. xlv, 424).

M. Ph. Barrey's *Le Havre Maritime du XVI<sup>e</sup> au XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, Hachette, 1917, pp. viii, 277) consists of three studies: one on the Normans in Morocco in the sixteenth century; one on "Havre Transatlantique", 1571-1610 (relations with Africa and South America); and a third, the most important to American readers, on Havre and navigation to the West Indies, the slave-trade, and the colonial question of 1789-1791.

An account of *Jean Perrault, Président de la Cour des Comptes sous Louis XIV.* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1917) has appeared from the pen of A. Perrault-Dabot.

*La Colonie Germanique de Bordeaux: Étude Historique, Juridique, Statistique, Économique* (Bordeaux, Feret, 1918, pp. xii, 263), by Alfred Leroux, deals in this first volume with the period prior to 1870. The word *Germanique* is used in its broadest sense and so includes the Dutch as an important element in the group, especially after the Edict of Nantes, from which time this Germanic colony practically dates.

The Société de l'Histoire de France has lately published the first volume (pp. xciv, 262) of a new edition of the *Mémoires Authentiques du Maréchal de Richelieu, 1725-1757*.

Paul Martin has studied *Les Idées de Turgot sur la Décentralisation Administrative* (Paris, Jouve, 1917, pp. 226).

Note may be made of the following recent publications relating to the French Revolution: Canon A. Durand's *Histoire Religieuse du Département du Gard pendant la Révolution Française* (vol. I., 1788-1792, Nîmes, Imp. Générale, 1918, pp. 476); Baron Marc de Villiers's *Reine Audu: les Légendes des Journées d'Octobre 1789* (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1918); Joseph Robin's *Le Roi de la Vendée, François-Athanase Charette, Lieutenant-Général de l'Armée Royale, 1763-1796* (Paris, Perrin, 1917, pp. xxix, 266); and A. Beaunier's *Figures d'Autrefois* (Paris, Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1917, pp. 311).

Students of military history will find much of interest in *Studies in Napoleonic Strategy* by Captain R. A. H. (Allen and Unwin), written while its author was in active service in the present war.

The July number of the *Revue des Études Napoléoniennes* presents a valuable body of new material for the history of the siege of Saragossa, from a letter-book of Marshal Lannes, duke of Montebello.

Some contributions to the history of the Third Republic will be found in *Vom Kaiserreich zur Republik, eine Französische Kulturgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, Hyperionverlag, 1917), by Max von Boehn; in *Les Deux Guerres, 1870-1871, 1914-1916, Images et Souvenirs* (Paris, Plon, 1917) by H. Cochin; and in *Les Carnets d'un Officier, 1909-1914* (Paris, Plon, 1918) by Jean Gonnet.



M. Joseph Reinach has enlarged his eulogistic *Vie Politique de Gambetta*, first published in 1883, by the printing, in a new edition (Paris, Alcan, 1918, pp. xviii, 318), of certain speeches, writings, and notes, such as notes concerning a proposed meeting of Gambetta and Bismarck in 1878 and concerning the Schnaebelé affair, and by the use of the correspondence between Gambetta and his friend Mme. Léon.

*Fighting France* (Appleton, pp. 230), by Lieut. Stéphane Lauzanne, editor-in-chief of the *Matin* and member of the French Mission to the United States, is a singularly clear interpretation of the spirit, mind, and wonderful vitality of his country.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. Mathorez, *Les Arméniens en France du XII<sup>e</sup> au XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Revue Historique, May); C. de la Roncière, *Un Grand Ministre de la Marine, Colbert* (Revue Hebdomadaire, June 1, 8); A. Chuquet, *La Jeunesse de Camille Desmoulins* (Revue d'Histoire Littéraire de la France, January); G. Rouanet, *Robespierre à la Constituante en Août 1789* (Annales Révolutionnaires, May); Doney-Lachambaudie, *Mémoire Justificatif de Barras, Fragments, I. L'Assassinat de Petitval, Séance Secrète du Directoire, 28 Avril 1796* (Revue Historique, May); A. Aulard, *La Société des Nations et la Révolution Française* (Révolution Française, March); P. de la Gorce, *Du 22 Prairial au 9 Thermidor: un Chapitre de l'Histoire de la Révolution* (Correspondant, June 10); E. Lenient, *Les Responsabilités Stratégiques et Morales de Napoléon: Marengo* (Annales Révolutionnaires, May); A. Blum, *La Caricature Politique en France sous le Consulat et l'Empire* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, May); P. Robiquet, *Fouché pendant les Cent-Jours* (Révolution Française, March-April); L. de Lanzac de Laborie, *Les Jésuites en France, sous la Restauration et la Monarchie de Juillet* (Correspondant, May 10); O. Festy, *Sismondi et la Condition des Ouvriers Français de son Temps, I.* (Revue d'Économie Politique, January); G. Lote, *Zola Historien du Second Empire* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, July).

#### ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

Joseph Orsier has published two studies in the medieval history of Savoy entitled *Pierre II. de Savoie, dit le Petit Charlemagne, 1202-1268*, and *Le Droit de Succession à la Couronne de Savoie du XII<sup>e</sup> au XIV<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, Champion, 1918).

The first volume of *Il Valore dei Sardi in Guerra* (Milan, Risorgimento, 1917, pp. 330), by M. Riccio is devoted to wars prior to the present Great War.

*Figures Italiennes d'Aujourd'hui* (Paris, Van Oest, 1918, pp. 267), by J. Destrée, contains sketches of Sonnino, Giolitti, Luzzatti, Barzilai, Battisti, Bisolati, Salvemini, D'Annunzio, Corradini, and Ferrero.

Michael Mayr has published a revised edition of his *Der Italienische*

*Irredentismus: sein Entstehen und seine Entwicklung vornehmlich in Tirol* (Innsbruck, Tyrolia, 1917). The opposing views are set forth by Whitney Warren in *Les Justes Revendications de l'Italie; la Question de Trente et de Trieste* (Paris, Renaissance, 1917).

The brief but creditable history of the Spanish School of History and Archaeology at Rome, set in operation in 1910 and suspended in 1914, is related by Padre Serrano in the *Revista Quincenal* for January 25, 1918. Padre Serrano has himself, after prolonged study of the nunciature in Spain, sent to the press the *Correspondencia Diplomática entre España y la Santa Sede durante el Pontificado de San Pio V. (1566-1572)*, in four volumes.

The Real Academia de la Historia has lately published (Madrid, 1918, pp. 472, folio) vol. XXIV. of the *Cortes de los Antiguos Reinos de Aragón y de Valencia y Principado de Cataluña*, carrying these important records down from 1450 to 1479.

Professor E. Ibarra y Rodríguez of Madrid with the aid of several of his students has published a collection of sixty documents relating to economic affairs in the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella as the first part of *Documentos de Asunto Económico correspondientes al Reinado de los Reyes Católicos, 1475-1516* (Madrid, 1917).

Antonio Agustín, Arquebisbe de Tarragona: *Diàlechs de les Armes y Llinatges de la Noblesa d'Espanya* (Barcelona, S. Babra), brings to modern readers the work of the sixteenth-century humanist and student of history, Antonio Agustín, in excellent form, with a valuable introduction from the hand of the translator, Señor J. Pin y Soler. Just when the ancient Spanish treatise was written is not certain; the present translation was made from a manuscript of 1603.

G. de Artiñano has written an *Historia del Comercio con las Indias durante el Dominio de los Austrias* (Barcelona, 1917, pp. 359).

The Spanish Minister of Public Instruction has made a grant for the publication of the *Anales de la Universidad de Valladolid*, written in the eighteenth century by Father Vicente Velázquez de Figueroa, and now to be edited and amplified by the librarian, Don Mariano Alcocer.

J. Goulven has written an account of *La Place de Mazagan sous la Domination Portugaise, 1502-1769* (Paris, Larose, 1917).

#### GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

Rudolph Huebner's substantial work on German law has been translated into English by Professor F. S. Philbrick and published by Messrs. Little, Brown, and Company, under the title *A History of Germanic Private Law*. The volume contains introductions by Sir Paul Vinogradoff and William E. Walz.

Otto Scheel has issued a life of *Martin Luther* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1916, pp. xii, 309).

Frieda Braune's *Edmund Burke in Deutschland: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Historisch-Politischen Denkens* (Heidelberg, Winter, 1917, pp. x, 227); Volper's *Friedrich Schlegel als Politischer Denker und Deutscher Patriot* (Berlin, Behn, 1917); and Blesch's *Studien über Johannes Wit, genannt von Döring, und seine Denkwürdigkeiten, nebst einem Exkurs über die Liberalen Strömungen von 1815-1819* (Berlin, Rothschild, 1917) are useful contributions to the history of the development of political thought in Germany.

Julien Rovère has made a careful and interesting study of *Les Survivances Françaises dans l'Allemagne Napoléonienne depuis 1815* (Paris, Alcan, 1918).

F. M. Kircheisen has published a new edition of the *Erinnerungen aus dem Aeussern Leben* (Munich, Müller, 1917, pp. vii, 370) of Ernst Moritz Arndt. Karl Linnebach is the compiler of *Karl und Maria von Clausewitz: ein Lebensbild in Briefen und Tagebuchblättern* (Berlin, Warneck, 1916, pp. v, 500). A *Leben und Wirken des Freiherrn Rochus von Liliencron, mit Beiträgen zur Geschichte der Allgemeinen Deutschen Biographie* (Berlin, Reimer, 1917, pp. 316) has been written by A. Bettelheim; Liliencron was the editor of the "*A. D. B.*" The first volume of *Carl Th. Michaelis, Persönliche und Amtliche Erinnerungen* (Leipzig, Dürr, 1917, pp. xi, 290), collected and edited by M. C. P. Schmidt, is devoted to a biographical account.

Professor J. von Pflugk-Harttung presents the German views on the problems of sea power in *Der Kampf um der Freiheit des Meeres: Trafalgar, Skagerrak* (Berlin, Eisenschmidt, 1917, pp. xx, 254).

German views of the attitude of the world toward peace will be found in *Die Friedensidee: ihr Ursprung, Anfänglicher Sinn und Allmählicher Wandel* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1917) by Hans Prutz.

The Abbé E. Wetterlé's book, mentioned in our last issue, has been translated from French into English with the title *Behind the Scenes in the Reichstag* (New York, George H. Doran), and will have much value for students as an authoritative record of things seen and learned by an intelligent deputy from Alsace-Lorraine during sixteen years of service in the Reichstag.

A popular historical survey of *Subject Peoples under the Teutons*, by Mr. Julian Park, appears as a bulletin of the University of Buffalo.

A picture of Germany in war-time, based not upon the personal impressions of an observer but upon a wide range of statistics concerning matters of economic importance, apparently compiled with much care, is presented by Mr. Cyril Brown, in *Germany as it is To-day* (Doran).

Mr. M. A. Morrison's *Sidelights on Germany: Studies of German Life and Character during the Great War* is chiefly drawn from the German newspapers of the last four years.

*Das Rottweiler Steuerbuch von 1441* (Tübingen, Laupp, 1917) by Mack; and *Die Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Prämonstratenserinnen-Klosters Oelinghausen* (Münster, Coppenrath, 1916, pp. viii, 152), by Dr. Franz Fischer, are recent additions to German local history.

A volume of *Studien zur Geschichte des Oesterreichischen Salzwesens* (Innsbruck, Wagner, 1917, pp. xi, 231) has been published by Professor Heinrich, Ritter von Srbik, in the *Forschungen zur Inneren Geschichte Oesterreichs*.

*Die Wiener Juden, Kommerz, Kultur, Politik, 1700-1900* (Vienna, Löwit, 1917, pp. x, 521) by Sigmund Mayer, and *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Juden in Steiermark* (Vienna, Braumüller, 1914, pp. x, 200) by Dr. Arthur Rosenberg, published in the *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutsch-Oesterreich*, are noteworthy contributions to the history of the Jews in Austria.

Dr. Anton Gnirs has published two volumes relating to the Görz district: *Das Görzer Statutbuch: eine Deutsche Ausgabe der Friauler Constitutiones des Patriarchen Marquard als Görzer Stadtrecht seit dem 15. Jahrhundert* (Vienna, Hölder, 1917); and *Oesterreichs Kampf für sein Südländ am Isonzo, 1615-1617, als ein Chronik des 2. Friauler Krieges nach zeitgenössischen Quellen* (Vienna, Seidel, 1916, pp. 171).

Recent numbers of the *Schweizer Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft* (Zürich, Leemann, 1917) are *Französische Politik in Solothurn zur Zeit des Schanzenbaues, 1667-1727* (pp. 317), by Dr. H. Dörfli; *Der Kampf ums Eschenthal und den Verrat von Domodossola im Zusammenhang mit der Erwerbung des Tessins* (pp. 330) by Dr. Karl Tanner; *Die Diplomatie des Auslandes in der Schweiz während der Zeit des Sonderbundes* (pp. 88) by Dr. Else Gutknecht; *Die Aeusserordentliche Standesversammlung und der Strafgericht vom Jahre 1794 in Chur* (pp. 272) by Dr. S. Pinösch; and *Die Letzte Allianz der Alten Eidgenossenschaft mit Frankreich vom 28. Mai 1777* (pp. 390) by Dr. Helen Wild.

Henri Fazy is the author of a thorough account of *Genève de 1788 à 1792: la Fin d'un Régime* (Geneva, Kundig, 1917, pp. vii, 560).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. W. Thompson, *Church and State in Mediaeval Germany*, III. (*American Journal of Theology*, July); A. E. Harvey, *Martin Luther in the Estimate of Modern Historians* (*ibid.*); C. H. Huberich and Richard King, *The Development of German Prize Law* (*Columbia Law Review*, June); Th. C. Buyse, *Le Régime Prussien en Pays Conquis: le Slesvig Danois, de 1864 à 1916*, III. (*Bibliothèque Universelle et Revue Suisse*, August, 1917); D. J. Hill, *Impressions of the Kaiser*, III., IV. (*Harper's Monthly*, July, August); V. S. Clark, *The German Press and German Opinion* (*Atlantic Monthly*, July); F. P. Giordani, *La Rivoluzione del '48 in Austria e gli Slavi* (*Rivista d'Italia*, December); W. Oechsli, *Die Namen des alten Bundes und seiner Gegentheile* (*Jahrbuch für Schweizerische Geschichte*, XLII., 1917).

## NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

The Linschoten Society has published, as its fifteenth volume, part II. of Gerrit de Veer's *Reizen van Willem Barents, Jacob van Heemskerck, Jan Cornelis Rijp en Anderen naar het Noorden, 1594-1597*, ed. S. P. L'Honoré Naber, containing the introduction and appendixes, maps, and other illustrations, and a bibliography of the northern voyages of the years named (the Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, pp. xii, 126, 183-341).

*Indexes* to German legislation for the occupied territories of Belgium (series VI.-IX., 1916, nos. 161-294), have been compiled by P. R. Blok, and printed in German, French, and Flemish (the Hague, M. Nijhoff, pp. 70).

The experiences of a Belgian woman are narrated anonymously in *Dans la Geôle Bruxelloise: Deux Années sous le Joug Allemand* (Paris, Van Oest, 1918).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: O. Genouy, *La Politique Française en Hollande avant la Saint-Barthélemy* (Bulletin Historique des Églises Wallonnes, serie 3, livr. 7); H. Pirenne, *Les Origines de l'État Belge* (Revue Belge, January); L. van Puyvelde, *De Vlaamsche Beweging en de Oorlog* (Gids, LXXXII. 1).

## NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

General review: L. Bréhier, *Histoire Byzantine: Publications des Années 1914-1915* (Revue Historique, July).

Dr. Maurice F. Egan, for ten years American minister to Denmark, has written a volume to be called *Ten Years on the German Frontier*, and to be published by the George H. Doran Company.

Much excellent material, some of it historical, is appearing in the monthly review *Le Monde Slave* (Paris, Rue Cassette, subscription, 30 francs), edited by Professor E. Denis and Robert de Caix. The first issue appeared in 1917.

A valuable and lucid study of a neglected subject will be found in Dr. W. H. Frere's *Some Links in the Chain of Russian Church History* (London, Faith Press).

The recollections of Dr. Martin Mandt have been edited by Veronika Lüke under the title *Ein Deutscher Arzt am Hofe Kaiser Nikolaus I. von Russland* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1917, pp. xv, 544).

*Russia, 1914-17: Memories and Recollections of War and Revolution*, by Gen. Basil Gourko, soon to be published by the house of Murray, should be a most important historical work, in view of the author's former position as chief of the Russian Imperial General Staff.

M. Philarète Chasles's *La Révolution Russe et la Guerre Européenne* contains valuable testimony from an experienced French writer of high

intelligence who was a spectator of events in Russia from November, 1916, to May, 1917.

*The Eclipse of Russia* (Doran, pp. 423), is the story of Russian autocracy and its preparation for anarchy, of the relations between the Tsar and the Kaiser, and of Rasputin and the Russian court, written by Dr. E. J. Dillon, a graduate of two Russian universities, a former professor in the University of Kharkov, once editor of a Russian newspaper, and an intimate of Count Witte. Other books of importance for the history of the Russian Revolution are Mr. Robert Wilson's *Russia's Agony* (Longmans), by one who for fourteen years represented in Russia the *London Times*, and Mr. A. J. Sack's *The Birth of the Russian Democracy* (New York, Russian Information Bureau, pp. 527), by a pronounced Russian socialist. Though the last-named book traces developments from the time of Alexander I., nearly half of it is given to the revolution of March, 1917, and to the events that succeeded it, up to the time of the Bolshevik *coup d'état*. Additional volumes on the last two years of revolutionary conditions in Russia are J. W. Bienstock's *Raspoutine, la Fin d'un Régime* (Paris, Michel, 1918), and the anonymous *Les "Dangers Mortels" de la Révolution Russe* (Paris, Payot, 1917).

*My Empress* (New York, John Lane Company), by Marfa Mouchanov, first maid-in-waiting to the Tsarina from the time of the latter's marriage until her exile to Siberia, is of much more value than the ordinary backstairs memoir, and has a certain importance for the history of the Romanov family during its last twenty-three years of rule.

*Donald Thompson in Russia* (Century Company), by Donald C. Thompson, is a photographer's record of observations of the Russian revolution and of Bolshevik rule.

*Les Ruthènes*, by Professor Stanislas Smolka (Bern, Ferdinand Wyss, 1917, pp. 45, 590), is a translation of the author's German book, *Die Russische Welt*. The author is a Pole, and much inclined to exalt the Poles and the Ukrainians (Ruthenians) at the expense of the Great Russians, but the book has value.

One of the "problem areas" of southeastern Europe is briefly treated by M. Francis Lebrun, correspondent in Rumania of the *Matin*, in *Etudes Documentaires sur les Questions Roumaines: la Dobroudja* (Paris, Alcan), an historical, geographical, ethnological, and statistical essay.

*Rumania Yesterday and Today*, by Will Gordon, announced by Mr. John Lane, contains an introduction and two chapters of personal experience written by the Queen of Rumania.

Mr. Alexander Devine is the author of an informing volume on *Montenegro: its Annals and its Fall* (Fisher Unwin).

Mr. T. R. Georgevitch, in three hundred well-documented pages on *Macedonia* (Allen and Unwin) sets forth the thesis that the Macedonians are Serbs with no racial kinship to or national sympathy with the Bulgarians.

Doubleday, Page, and Company will publish in October the account by Mr. Henry Morgenthau of his experiences as ambassador in Turkey, which has been running for some months in the *World's Work*.

Various topics of Near Eastern affairs furnish subjects for L. Bloy's *Constantinople et Byzance* (Paris, Crès, 1918); and *Bagdad, son Chemin de Fer, son Importance, son Avenir* (Paris, Éditions et Librairie, 1917) by E. Aublé, a French engineer and agent in Mesopotamia.

*Armenia: a Martyr Nation*, by M. C. Gabrielian (Fleming H. Revell) is primarily a history of the religion of the country.

The narrative of a single Armenian family's escape from massacre is presented in a pamphlet of 45 pages, *From Turkish Toils* (George H. Doran Company), by Mrs. Esther Mugerditchian, wife of an Armenian pastor and British vice-consul in Diarbekir, with great simplicity of statement but with such intelligence and such tragic detail as to make it a contribution of real significance in the history of a great episode.

In the series *Pages Actuelles* (Paris, Bloud and Gay), no. 115-116, by the Abbé Eugène Griselle, is entitled *Syriens et Chaldéens, leur Martyre, leurs Espérances*, and is made up from reports and documents of the Bishop of Van, of a Lazarist missionary in Persia, of the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, and similar sources.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Mikhail Katkov, *Lettres au Tsar Alexandre III*. [five important letters, December, 1886-May, 1887, on Russia's future relations to Germany and France] (Correspondant, April 10); A. Gratieux, *L'Église Russe et la Révolution* (Le Monde Slave, February-March); F. A. Golder, *The Russian Revolution* (The [Canadian] University Magazine, April); S. Reizler, *Le Dernier Romanov en Sibérie* (Revue Hebdomadaire, June 8); H. Laporte, *Quatre Mois de Bolchevisme, Russie, Finlande: Notes de Voyage, Janvier-Mai 1918* (Correspondant, May 25, June 10); E. Denis, *L'Armée Chèque* (Le Monde Slave, December, 1917); *The Four Treaties of Bucarest* (Quarterly Review, July); E. Denis, *La Bulgarie et la Diplomatie Alliée* (Le Monde Slave, November, 1917); *La Question des Détroits: l'Histoire et les Hypothèses*, II. (Correspondant, May 25).

#### THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

Messrs. Macmillan have issued a new edition of Col. L. J. Trotter's *History of India*, first published in 1874. The present edition contains chapters on Lord Curzon's administration, and the Durbar of 1911, in addition to notes throughout the volume, supplied by Archdeacon Hutton.



The Clarendon Press announces for early publication Mr. Vincent A. Smith's *Oxford History of India*, which tells the story of India from early times to 1911.

February 6, 1919, will be the one-hundredth anniversary of the hoisting of the British flag on the island of Singapore by Sir Stamford Raffles, who had acquired it for the East India Company from the Sultan of Johor. The event will be commemorated by the preparation and publication of a comprehensive and authoritative history of these hundred years of a city than which few are more important in the modern history of the world's commerce.

Light on an adjoining field, about the time of Singapore's foundation, from original sources carefully investigated, may be found in P. H. van der Kemp, *Oost-Indië's Inwendig Bestuur van 1817 op 1818* (the Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, pp. xxxii, 352).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Lorenzo Pérez, *Cartas y Relaciones del Japón* [cont.] (Archivo Ibero-Americano, March-April); A. Gérard, *Les Hommes d'État du Japon, 1868-1918* (Correspondant, May 25); F. W. Williams, *The Mid-Victorian Attitude of Foreigners in China* (Journal of Race Development, April); W. H. Moreland and A. Yusuf Ali, *Akbar's Land-Revenue System as described in the Ain-i-Akbari* (Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, January).

#### AFRICA

Mr. E. C. Godée Molsbergen has edited for the Linschoten Vereeniging two interesting volumes, 1652-1686 and 1686-1806, of *Reizen in Zuid-Afrika in de Hollandse Tijd* (the Hague, Nijhoff).

Sir Hugh Clifford is the author of a volume announced by Mr. John Murray, entitled *The German Colonies, with special relation to the Native Populations of Africa*. From a quite different point of view is *War in Africa and the Far East*, by H. C. O'Neill, relating to the conquest of the German colonies (Longmans).

#### AMERICA

##### GENERAL ITEMS

Among recent accessions of the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress are papers of Edmond C. Genet, 1756-1827, Philip R. Fendall, 1823-1860, Benjamin Stoddert, 1784-1809, Samuel Blodget, 1758-1813, and General Samuel W. Crawford, 1860-1861; additions to the Argenteau Papers, 1300-1880, amounting to about 7000 pieces; and three large folio volumes from the papers of William Blathwayt, being the original entry-book of colonial letters patent, commissions, etc., prepared by him for the use of the Lords of Trade.

The Library of Congress has published a *Check List of Collections of Personal Papers* possessed by historical societies, university and public

libraries, and other learned institutions in the United States. This publication (pp. 87), which can be obtained for thirty cents from the Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office in Washington, furnishes useful guidance to an extraordinary variety of manuscript materials for American history.

Ten volumes of the notable series, *Chronicles of America*, edited by Professor Allen Johnson, are being distributed to subscribers by the publishers, the Yale University Press.

A *History of the American People* for grammar grades and junior high schools, by Professor C. A. Beard and W. C. Bagley, has been published by Macmillan.

How American history is presented to the Dutch public by an intelligent writer may be seen in C. te Lintum, *De Geschiedenis van het Amerikaansche Volk* (Zutphen, Thieme and Company, pp. iv, 306, with maps and illustrations).

The Boston Book Company has brought out a *Guide to the Use of United States Government Publications*, by Edith E. Clarke.

Volume III. of A. W. Calhoun's *Social History of the American Family* has come from the press (Arthur H. Clark Company).

It is announced that Mr. Henry E. Huntington has acquired the historical and literary manuscripts collected by Dr. William K. Bixby of St. Louis. The collection is a remarkable one, embracing the journals of André and Burr and numerous letters of Washington.

The *Catholic Historical Review* for July has for its first article an excellent general account by Rev. Dr. J. B. Culemans of the Catholic Explorers and Pioneers of Illinois. Dr. Edwin Ryan, under the title Diocesan Organization in the Spanish Colonies, treats of episcopal visitations of Florida between 1565 and 1819, and of synodal and episcopal legislation specially affecting that parish (St. Augustine). The third article, by Professor Frederick J. Zwierlein, on New Netherland Intolerance, traverses with some fresh material the ground covered, with respect to this subject, by his valuable volume on *Religion in New Netherland*. The document printed in this number is an account of a voyage from San Blas to northern Alaska in 1799 by the frigates *Princesa* and *Favorita*, translated from a manuscript in the archives of the University of Santa Clara, Cal. There is also the beginning of a diocesan bibliography of American Catholic history.

Attention should be called to the valuable work which is being done by the committee on historical records established by the National Catholic War Council of the United States of America and in operation since January last, with the Rt. Rev. Mgr. H. T. Drumgoole as chairman and Professor Peter Guilday as secretary. It is making systematic endeavors, on a large scale, to preserve accurate and complete records of all Catholic American activity in the present war.

The June number of the *Historical Records and Studies* of the United States Catholic Historical Society contains a paper on the Church in the Island of San Domingo, by Peter Condon; one on Catholics in the War with Mexico, by Thomas F. Meehan; a sketch of Francis Cooper, New York's First Catholic Legislator, by William H. Bennett; an account of the destruction of the Ursuline convent at Charlestown, Massachusetts, in 1834, as related in 1887 by the leader of the mob; a narrative of a voyage to Alaska by Father Riobo in 1779, translated from the Spanish by Rev. Walter F. Thornton, S. J.; and the story of Pierre Toussaint, a Catholic Uncle Tom, by Henry Binsse.

The principal contents of the June number of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* are continued articles hitherto mentioned: papers concerning the San Domingo Refugees in Philadelphia, Bishop Flaget's Diary, and the Life of Bishop Conwell. Under the title Missionary Journeys in Alaska appears a letter of Father Philip I. Delon, S. J., to the Very Rev. Richard A. Gleeson, S. J., written from Akularak, May 29, 1916.

#### ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association*, vol. V., no. 1 (January-March, 1918), is a monograph entitled *A Further Study of Prehistoric Small House Ruins in the San Juan Watershed*, by T. Mitchell Prudden.

*Beaumarchais and the War of American Independence*, in two volumes, by Elizabeth S. Kite, has been added to Messrs. Badger's series of *Studies in American History*.

Last winter Professor Aulard devoted his chief course at the Sorbonne to the historical origins of friendly relations between France and America. The opening lecture is printed in *La Révolution Française* for November-December.

*Benjamin Rush and his Services to American Education*, by Harry G. Good, has been brought out in Bluffton, Ohio, by the American Educator Company. The author has made use of the Rush manuscripts in the Ridgeway Library, Philadelphia.

*John H. B. Latrobe and his Times, 1803-1891*, by John E. Semmes (Baltimore, Norman Remington Company), may be said to possess greater significance because of the "times" in which Latrobe lived than because of his own achievements. Counsel for the Baltimore and Ohio railroad, president of the American Colonization Society, inventor, writer, artist, he came in contact with many remarkable personalities, and his record of them is interesting.

A study of Lincoln from a purely local point of view is that presented by Miss Octavia Roberts in her *Lincoln in Illinois* (Houghton Mifflin), largely built up from the recollections of those who knew Lincoln as a neighbor and friend.

The July number of *The Military Historian and Economist* continues Professor Johnston's study of Pope's campaigns in Virginia by a chapter on Gainesville. Herewith the journal suspends publication, for the present.

The Navy Department has brought out another volume of the *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion*, series I., vol. 72 (Washington, 1917, pp. xxiv, 829), compiled and edited by Mr. Charles W. Stewart, and containing reports, orders, and correspondence, both Union and Confederate, relating to naval forces on western waters, January 1–September 6, 1865, and to supply vessels, 1861–1865.

Hon. Simon Wolf of Washington, D. C., who has enjoyed many years' contact with public affairs, particularly as a champion of Jewish rights, has privately printed a volume of reminiscences touching upon American history in general and especially upon the modern history of the Jews in the United States. For convenience of treatment the author has grouped his incidents around the various presidential administrations and the book is entitled *The Presidents I have known from 1860 to 1918* (pp. 450). Orders should be sent to the author, Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

*A Diplomat's Helpmate: How Rose F. Foote, Wife of the First United States Minister and Envoy Extraordinary to Korea, served her Country in the Far East*, is the title of a book by Mary V. Tingley Lawrence published in San Francisco by H. S. Crocker.

#### THE UNITED STATES IN THE WAR

Many of Secretary Baker's war addresses and writings have been published in *Frontiers of Freedom* (Doran, pp. 335). In *Secretary Baker at the Front* (Century Company), an account of his tour of inspection in France, written by his private secretary, is presented.

Three more numbers of the *University of Chicago War Papers* have appeared, viz., *The War and Industrial Readjustments*, by Professor Harold G. Moulton; *England and America*, by Professor Conyers Read; and *Democracy and American Schools*, by Charles H. Judd, director of the School of Education.

*Our First Year in the Great War* (Putnam, pp. 127), by Maj.-Gen. Francis V. Greene, consists for the most part of articles reprinted from the *New York Times*, reviewing the country's accomplishments under such headings as man power, transportation, censorship, tactics, etc.

Messrs. Dodd, Mead, and Company announce for early publication *America in France*, by Maj. Frederick Palmer, the well-known war correspondent, now attached to General Pershing's staff in France.

Coningsby Dawson, who was commissioned by the British govern-

ment to visit the American army in France, gives an account of this visit in *Out to Win: the Story of America in France* (Lane, pp. 206).

Corp. Osborne De Varila, 6th U. S. Field Artillery, who fired the first shot of the American army, has written *The First Shot for Liberty* (Winston, pp. 223), a lively account of the entrance of American troops into France and of experiences in the trenches.

Firmin Roz has made the translation and Ambassador J. J. Jusserand has written the preface for *Amis de la France, la Service de Campagne de l'Ambulance Américaine décrit par ses Membres* (Paris, Plon).

Ralph D. Paine in *The Fighting Fleets* depicts in somewhat picturesque language the work of the American fleet in our first year of war.

(See also pp. 152-159.)

#### LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

##### NEW ENGLAND

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the New England Historic and Genealogical Society (by aid of the Eddy Town Record Fund) have printed the vital records, to 1850, of the towns of Charlemont, Cohasset, Hardwick, Harvard, Northbridge, Salem (vol. II., births), and Stoneham.

The Massachusetts Historical Society has distributed photostat sets of *Domestic Intelligence; or News both from City and Country*, a London newspaper which was published from July 9, 1679, to April 15, 1681, in 114 issues. Apart from its interest as a record of news at the time of the Popish Plot, it was edited and published by Benjamin Harris, a printer who afterwards came to Massachusetts and has been regarded as the author, as he was the publisher, of the *New England Primer*. The March-April serial of the *Proceedings* of the society contains the annual reports, remarks in commemoration of Henry Adams and F. B. Sanborn, and a paper by Professor George F. Moore on Ezra Stiles's Studies in the Cabala.

In the July number of the *Essex Institute Historical Collections* Francis B. C. Bradlee gives a history of the Boston and Lowell, Nashua and Lowell, and Salem and Lowell railroads, early lines now all embraced in the Boston and Maine system.

*A History of Swansea, Massachusetts, 1667-1917*, edited by Otis O. Wright, is published in Swansea by the town.

Hartford Camp 50, Sons of Veterans, through its secretary, Mr. Charles R. Hale, has for two years been engaged in a systematic attempt, now already carried well forward toward completion, to locate and mark graves of the soldiers of wars in which Connecticut has been engaged, as found in the cemeteries of Hartford County. The procedure is unusually elaborate and serviceable.

## MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The Division of Archives and History of the University of the State of New York has placed in the printers' hands volume III. of the *Early Records of Albany*, containing the translations made by Professor Pearson and revised by Mr. A. J. F. van Laer. It is about to do the same with the first two volumes of the *Papers of Sir William Johnson*; and has, in various stages of advancement, inventories and histories of the records of the city of Kingston, of the town of North Hempstead, of Suffolk County, and of the village of Ballston.

The New York Historical Society *Quarterly Bulletin* for July contains an account by R. P. Bolton of the work of the society's field exploration committee, and a record of the baptisms of the First Presbyterian Church, New York city, 1804-1805.

The Buffalo Historical Society, in co-operation with Hamilton College, is preparing to issue as a volume the journal and letters of Rev. Samuel Kirkland, missionary to the Seneca and Oneida Indians, United States Indian agent, and founder of Hamilton College.

Mr. H. E. Deats of Flemington, New Jersey, has prepared and published *Marriage Records of Hunterdon County, New Jersey, 1795-1875*, vol. I. (pp. 337), being an index to the marriages recorded in the office of the county clerk. The filing of records of marriages in the clerks' offices of New Jersey counties began in 1795 and ceased to be obligatory in 1876. The area includes not only the present Hunterdon County but, from 1795 to 1838, nearly all of Mercer County. The second volume, now under preparation, for ultimate issue, will contain marriage data derived from township, church, and family records.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has recently acquired seven folio volumes of letter-books of John Nicholson, 1796-1797, embracing many letters to Robert Morris.

*The German Drama in English on the Philadelphia Stage from 1794 to 1830, preceded by a General Account of the Theatre in Philadelphia from 1749 to 1796*, by Charles F. Brede, has been published by the Americana Germanica Press.

In the July number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* is an account by Mrs. Agnes M. H. Gormly, of the community of Harmonists who established the settlement of Harmony in Butler County, Pa., in 1804, removed to Indiana in 1814, and returned to Pennsylvania in 1825, establishing a community which they named Economy. The *Magazine* prints a letter from W. H. Harrison to Harmar Denny, December 2, 1838, responding to the notification of his nomination for the presidency by the Anti-Masonic convention.

The University of Pittsburg has received as a gift the library of the late William M. Darlington, and his widow, Mary O'Hara Darlington, a

collection of about ten thousand volumes, chiefly of English and American history.

#### SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

*A Selected Bibliography and Syllabus of the History of the South, 1584-1876*, by Professors W. K. Boyd of Trinity College and R. P. Brooks of the University of Georgia, constitutes the *Bulletin of the University of Georgia* for June. The principles of selection in the bibliographical portion are not always clear. The syllabus presents a chronological and topical outline of the history of the South through the Reconstruction period, with references to sources and historical accounts appended to each chapter.

The Virginia State Library has recently acquired a type-written copy of Governor Jefferson's letter-book, July 27-September 13, 1780, the original of which, carried off from Richmond by Benedict Arnold, has been recently presented to the British Museum; also a detailed card inventory of the records of Northampton County.

The Virginia Historical Society will keep a careful record of all Virginians who lose their lives in the Great War, and will publish the compiled lists quarterly in the issues of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*. The July number of the magazine contains the list of deaths to about the end of June. The society, having recently taken an inventory of its collections (books, newspapers, manuscripts, maps, portraits, and other articles of historical interest), prints in this issue of the magazine a synopsis of this inventory.

The North Carolina Historical Commission has recently received from the governor's office 2786 executive documents, embracing portions of the correspondence and other papers of Governors Owen, Graham, Manly, Reid, Vance, Holden, Worth, Caldwell, and Brogden (1828-1830, 1845-1854, 1862-1879). From private sources it has secured three Civil War diaries of the late Col. W. H. S. Burgwin, and 910 letters from the private correspondence of Chief Justice Walter Clark. The Pettigrew Papers, 1772-1900 (Bishop Charles Pettigrew, Ebenezer Pettigrew, M. C., and Gen. J. J. Pettigrew, C. S. A.), and the Robert J. Miller Papers have been bound and made ready for use. The commission has published volume I. of the *Papers of [Chief Justice] Thomas Ruffin*, edited by Professor J. G. DeR. Hamilton, embracing his correspondence from 1803 to 1830. Volume II. is in press.

The *Proceedings* of the eighteenth annual session of the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina (*Publications* of the North Carolina Historical Commission, Bulletin no. 23) contains a very interesting paper by Dr. Gaillard Hunt, entitled *Reminiscences of the Secretaries of State*. Other historical papers are: *Influence of Peculiar Conditions in the Early History of North Carolina*, by Paul B. Barringer; *Historical Parallels*, by D. H. Hill; *Influence of the Civil War*



on Education in North Carolina, by Edgar W. Knight; the South's Pension and Relief Provisions for the Soldiers of the Confederacy, by William H. Glasson; Medical and Pharmaceutical Conditions in the Confederacy, by E. Vernon Howell; and the Raising, Organization, and Equipment of North Carolina's Troops in the Civil War, by Judge Walter Clark. R. D. W. Connor, secretary of the North Carolina Historical Commission, describes the work of the commission during the year, and there is a North Carolina bibliography for 1917, by Mrs. E. R. Blanton.

The South Carolina Historical Commission has published a volume of *Commissions and Instructions from the Lords Proprietors of Carolina to Public Officials of South Carolina, 1685-1715* (pp. 292), edited by A. S. Salley, jr., secretary of the commission.

The April number of the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* contains, besides continued articles heretofore mentioned, a paper by Judge Henry A. M. Smith, entitled Hog Island and Shute's Folly, concerning islands which have almost entirely disappeared, the latter having been the site of Castle Pinckney.

#### WESTERN STATES

The June number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* contains an article by Mr. William L. Jenks surveying Territorial Legislation by Governor and Judges, Professor Eugene C. Barker's paper on Stephen F. Austin, read before the American Historical Association at its last meeting, an article by Mr. Melvin J. White on Populism in Louisiana during the Nineties, and a survey of recent historical activities in the Old Northwest, by Professor Arthur C. Cole.

The Western Reserve Historical Society has recently acquired the private papers and correspondence of Senator Theodore E. Burton and a collection of some two thousand papers of General Braxton Bragg, C. S. A.

The July number of the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* is a monograph entitled *The Indian in Ohio*, by H. C. Shetrone. The principal part of the monograph is devoted to a history of the Indian in Ohio in his relation with the white race, and to Indian archaeology in Ohio.

The April-June number of the *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio* contains a fifth group of selections from the Follett Papers. The letters are of the period 1848-1856, and the principal writers are Salmon P. Chase, Joseph Medill, Thomas Ewing, Millard Fillmore, and Lewis D. Campbell.

Mr. John C. Dean publishes at Indianapolis the *Journal of Thomas Dean, an Account of a Journey to Indiana in 1817*.

Articles in the June number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* are: Some Reminiscences of James Whitcomb Riley, by George S. Cottman; an Historical Sketch of Tell City, by Will Maurer; a brief Diary of the Mexican War, October, 1847, to July, 1848, by Thomas Bailey, and the conclusion of J. Edward Murr's paper concerning Lincoln in Indiana.

*The Making of a Township, being an Account of the Early Settlement and Subsequent Development of Fairmount Township, Grant County, Indiana, 1829 to 1917*, is a part of the title of a volume edited by E. M. Baldwin and published by him in Fairmount.

The Illinois Historical Survey (University of Illinois) has acquired from archives in Paris some 3000 photostats and 2100 transcripts of documents relating to the early history of the Mississippi Valley; also some 6000 pages of transcripts from the Archives of the Indies at Seville, obtained through Dr. Charles H. Cunningham, and relating to Spanish Louisiana, the Mississippi Valley, and the Revolutionary War.

As a part of the general centennial celebration in Illinois there were numerous celebrations at historic places July 4, especially notable being the Kaskaskia celebration and the Starved Rock pageant. The former was held at Chester and Fort Gage and included addresses by Governor Lowden and the Masque of Illinois, by Wallace Rice. August 26, the hundredth anniversary of the adoption of the first constitution, special exercises were held, which included addresses by Governor Lowden and former President Roosevelt. The greatest celebration of the year is to be held in Springfield in the first week in October, commemorating the hundredth anniversary of the inauguration of the first governor of the state.

The legislative reference bureau of Illinois intends to bring out, under the general editorial direction of Dr. W. F. Dodd, a volume containing the three constitutions of Illinois, with annotations and introduction, and one reprinting the journal of the Constitutional Convention of 1848, printed originally in the *Springfield Register*. A third volume will contain a reprint of the territorial laws, beginning with the Northwest Territory.

Included in the volume of *Transactions* of the Illinois State Historical Society for the year 1917 are the following papers read at the annual meeting: Contemporary Vandalism, the annual address, by Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones; the Movement of the Population of Illinois, 1870-1910, by Professor Ernest L. Bogart; Illinois and the Underground Railroad to Canada, by Verna Cooley; Lincoln and the Presidential Election of 1864, by Professor A. C. Cole; and the article of Stephen A. Day concerning the Debs case, also found in the *Journal* of the Illinois State Historical Society for July, 1917. The volume also contains a reprint, from the *Transactions of the Illinois State Agricultural Society*, vol. II. (1856-1857), of a paper on the Agricultural Resources of Southern Illinois, by John Reynolds.

Among the contents of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, July, 1917, are a paper by Stephen A. Day concerning a Celebrated Illinois Case that made History (the Debs case, 1894); a sketch of Thomas Beard, the founder of Beardstown, Ill., by Rev. P. C. Croll; one of Thomas Lippincott, a pioneer of 1818, together with a short diary of his journey from Pennsylvania, edited by President Charles H. Rammelkamp; a letter of Ninian Edwards to Nathaniel Pope, August, 1813; and a paper by Mrs. Jessie Palmer Weber, apropos of the centennial celebration, characterizing a "Hundred Years of Progress in Illinois".

Early in the present year the Illinois Catholic Historical Society was organized, partly as a result of the movement to commemorate the centennial of the state's admission into the Union. It has begun, with a June number, the issue of the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review*, under the editorial direction of Mr. Joseph J. Thompson of Chicago. With analogous purposes, a committee of the Jewish Historical Society of Illinois is preparing a centennial history of the Jews of Illinois.

The *Tennessee Historical Magazine* begins in the March number the publication of a history of Indian Wars and Warriors of the Old Southwest, 1730-1807, by Albert V. Goodpasture. The same number contains an article by Charles C. Trabue on the Voluntary Emancipation of Slaves in Tennessee as reflected in the State's Legislation and Judicial Decisions. In the section of Documents appear sketches of Felix Grundy, Justice John Catron, and James K. Polk, taken from a diary of S. H. Laughlin, some of whose diaries were published in the issue of the *Magazine* for March, 1916.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has received the manuscript papers of John H. Tweedy, territorial delegate for Wisconsin in the 1840's, and for many years a leading lawyer and citizen of Milwaukee; also the letter-books of Hon. George P. Smith of Madison, prominent in legal and political affairs in the period from 1840 to 1870. The society has issued volume XXV. of its *Collections*, *An English Settler in Pioneer Wisconsin* (Edward Bottomley). It also has in proof volume XXVI. of the *Collections*, which is the first volume of the *Documentary History of the Constitution of Wisconsin*, and a report on the public archives of the state, prepared by Theodore Blegen. Volume II. of the constitutional series will follow shortly. A second volume of the Calendar of the Draper Collection (Kentucky series) is in press; a volume relating to treaties with the Northwestern Indians is in preparation. The society has begun an extensive enterprise of copying with the photostat various files of early American newspapers published in the Middle West; it has arranged with the Missouri Historical Society for the reproduction of the files of Missouri newspapers still in existence down to 1825.

The June number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* prints three letters of the late Senator Paul O. Husting of Wisconsin, setting

forth his views at three critical moments of recent history. The first is dated May 14, 1915, a few days after the sinking of the *Lusitania*, and discusses questions of international law and neutrality; the second, dated April 1, 1916, deals primarily with the question of embargo on munitions; the third, dated May 19, 1917, sets forth the fundamental purposes of the war against Germany. Other articles are: a sketch of Col. Elmer E. Ellsworth, by Charles A. Ingraham; and an examination of the Paul Revere Print of the Boston Massacre, by Miss Louise P. Kellogg. Some account is also given of the papers of Rev. Matthew Dinsdale (1815-1898) and of those of Dr. Azel Ladd, superintendent of public instruction in Wisconsin, 1851-1852, which have recently come into the possession of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. The September number has articles on the Bennett Law in Wisconsin, by Miss Kellogg, and My Recollections of Civil War Days, by Mrs. Lathrop Smith. The early history of the United States army is illustrated by an original journal of St. Clair's campaign, kept by Capt. Samuel Newman, U. S. A., and never heretofore published.

The Minnesota Historical Society has installed a photostat, and is now prepared to make, for a reasonable fee, photographic reproductions of material in its possession. The principal contribution to the May number of the *Minnesota History Bulletin* is the address of Professor Lester B. Shippee at the annual meeting of the society in January on Social and Economic Effects of the Civil War with special Reference to Minnesota.

The July number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* contains a paper by Dan E. Clark on Frontier Defense in Iowa, 1850-1865, one by W. W. Gist on the Ages of the Soldiers in the Civil War, and one by Professor Louis B. Schmidt on the Influence of Wheat and Cotton on Anglo-American Relations during the Civil War.

In the series of the Historical Society of Iowa, *Iowa and War*, the June and July numbers are *The Mexican War*, by Cyril B. Upham, and *War Proclamations by Governor Harding* (1917 and 1918).

Messrs. Heath have issued a *History of Missouri*, by Professor E. M. Violette of the Kirkville Normal School.

*Nebraska History and Record of Pioneer Days*, vol. I., nos. 3 and 4 (double number, April and May), contains a number of sketches of pioneers and early settlers, an account of the first railroad excursion to Nebraska, also some account of the Union Club, organized in Brownville in 1863, characterized as the Civil War substitute for a council of defense.

The July number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* reprints from the June number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* Professor Eugene C. Barker's paper on Stephen F. Austin. Other articles in the *Quarterly* are: Acapulco and the Manila Galleon, by William L. Schurz; a first installment of Reminiscences of the Terry Rangers, by

J. K. P. Blackburn; and the third installment of the Minutes of the Ayuntamiento of San Felipe de Austin, 1828-1832, edited by Professor Barker.

The July number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* contains an article by Charles M. Buchanan entitled the Evolution of an Indian Hero in France, being a sketch of Chief Se-at-thi; a bibliography of Isaac I. Stevens, by Rose M. Boening; a further selection from David Thompson's Journeys in the Spokane Country, edited by T. C. Elliott; a continuation of Professor Edmond S. Meany's account of the Origin of Washington Geographic Names; and a continuation of the proceedings of the Washington constitutional convention of 1878.

*The Oregon Mission: the Story of how the Line was run between Canada and the United States*, by Bishop James W. Bashford, is from the Abingdon Press.

The California Historical Survey Commission has just placed in the hands of the printer the copy for its *Guide to County Archives*, which will soon be published. The volume will be well illustrated with maps showing all the changes in county boundaries since the organization of the state. At the request of the State Council of Defense the Historical Survey Commission is preparing to co-operate with that body in supervising records and gathering information dealing with the war activities carried on within the state. Dr. Owen C. Coy, of Berkeley, Cal., is the executive officer of the commission.

*Pasadena, California*, by J. W. Wood (San Francisco, J. J. Newbegin) offers a full history of that city, dwelling especially upon the original organization of the Indiana colony in California.

#### AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

The contents of the May number of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* have been partially described by anticipation in these pages. The bibliographical matter supplied by Professor Charles E. Chapman, and which is to be completed in the August number, proves to be a description of some 207 *legajos* in the Archives of the Indies at Seville, 36 of them from the section called "Papeles de Estado", and the rest from that styled "Audiencias". The descriptions are a by-product of the work done by Dr. Chapman in preparing his *Catalogue of Materials in the Archivo General de Indias for the History of the Pacific Coast and the American Northwest*. That work, shortly to appear, is confined to the region suggested by its title. The present descriptions are prepared with a view to the interests of a wider group of historical scholars.

In *The Virgin Islands of the United States of America*, Mr. Luther K. Zabriskie (Putnam) gives a brief history of the islands, to which he adds a mass of information of a commercial nature, consular reports, import and export statistics, and the like.

*The Rise of the Spanish-American Republics*, by Professor W. S. Robertson of Illinois (Appleton) gives an account of the liberation of those countries from Spanish rule in the form of biographies of the great leaders of their revolutions.

Germany's peaceful penetration of South America can be followed in the naturalist Émile R. Wagner's *L'Allemagne et l'Amérique Latine* (Paris, Alcan).

The Hakluyt Society has recently issued part IV., book II., of *The War of Chiapas*, translated and edited by the late Sir Clements R. Markham, being the "Civil Wars of Peru", written by the sixteenth-century historian Pedro de Cieza de León.

Professor Rómulo D. Carbia and other members of the faculty of philosophy in the University of Buenos Aires have co-operated in the production of a *Manual de Historia de la Civilización Argentina*, of which the first volume has been published (Buenos Aires, Fransetti, 1917).

The influence of the Encyclopaedists on the revolutionists of Argentina is ably set forth by M. José P. Otero in *La Révolution Argentine, 1810-1816* (Paris, Bossard).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Salvador Massip, *The Discovery of America by the Chinese* (Inter-America, June); A. de Altolaquirre y Duval, *La Patria de D. Cristóbal Colón, según las Actas Notariales de Italia* (Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia, March); *id.*, *Los Argumentos aducidos para demostrar que Don Cristóbal Colón nació en Galicia* (*ibid.*, June); M. F. Vallette, *Work of the Spanish Friars on the American Continent in the Sixteenth Century* (American Catholic Quarterly Review, January); A. J. Morrison, *The Historical Farmer in America* (South Atlantic Quarterly, July); Woodbridge Riley, *Early Free-Thinking Societies in America* (Harvard Theological Review, July); F. P. Renaut, *La Politique des États-Unis dans l'Amérique du Nord Espagnole, sous le Règne de Joseph Bonaparte, 1808-1814* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, February); J. S. Bassett, *The Significance of the Administration of Rutherford B. Hayes* (South Atlantic Quarterly, July); C. R. Lingley, *Characteristics of President Cleveland* (Political Science Quarterly, June); P. Darcy, *L'Avant-guerre Pangermaniste aux États-Unis* (Correspondant, April 25); G. Lechartier, *Les Intrigues Allemandes aux États-Unis: la Mission du Comte Bernstorff et son Échec* (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 15); Henry Rood, *Defeating the German Spy System in America* (Century Magazine, July); Nesmo, *Les Causes de l'Entrée en Guerre des États-Unis* (Revue Hebdomadaire, June 15); Waldo G. Leland, *America's First Year of War* (Quarterly Review, July); Lieutenant-Colonel D., *Au Front Américain: l'Organisation de l'Armée, les Soldats, les Officiers, leurs Idées sur la Guerre* (Correspondant, May 10); Julio Villoldo, *The Civilian Republic [Cuba]* (Inter-America, June).